OF THE
Incurable Scepticism
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
ROME.

Translated from M. de Placette and published by Dr. Jenison Archbp. of Canterbury.

IMPRIMATUR.

Jebson's Resurrection Vol. III. Dis. XVII. p. 55.

Hic Liber Cui Titulus [Of the Incurable Scepticism of the Church of *ROME.*]

Octob. 20. 1687.

GUIL. NEEDHAM

LONDON:
Printed for Ric. Chiswel at the *Rose* and Crown in St. *Pauls Church yard*, MDLXXXVIII.

Clark

PREFACE.

AMong the manifold accuſations, with which the Papiſts are wont to defame our moſt holy Religion, there is none which they oftner alledge, or more ſeriouſly endeavour to evince, or confirm with more plauſible arguments, than that whereby they pretend that we utterly overthrow all certainty in divine matters, and conſequently Faith it ſelf. This is the conſtant ſubject of their Writings and Diſcourſes, this is of late their only argument. To obviate therefore theſe importunate clamours, I reſolved throughly to examin the whole Argument; and inquire whether there be any truth in thoſe things which many obtrude for moſt certain. Having then with ſome diligence conſidered the matter, I ſoon found, firſt that thoſe things are falſe and and frivolous, which are commonly oppoſed to us; and then that our Adverſaries themſelves are manifeſtly guilty of that crime, wherewith they aſperſe us, and can by no Arts be purged from it. For both that celebrated infallibility of the Church and of her Governours, upon which the whole Syſtem of Popiſh Faith relies, is eaſily proved to be null and feigned, and that even if it were true, it could yet produce no aſſurance of Faith, no certainty of belief. To evidence and evince all this I thought not unfit; and therefore have undertaken to demonſtrate theſe three things.

I. That it is moſt falſe what is pretended with ſo much confidence, that the Church, at leaſt in the ſence by them underſtood, cannot erre.

II. That granting the Church cannot erre, this her Infallibility is of that nature, that both it ſelf labours with inextricable difficulties, and can confer certainty upon nothing elſe.

III. That our Faith relieth upon far more firm foundations; and that nothing is believed by us, which is not both certain in it ſelf, and ſuch as the certainty of it cannot be unknown by us.

Of these three Propositions, which may in time, God willing, be demonstrated, I have now undertaken the Second, because that may be comprehended in a much shorter Discourse than the rest. I will shew therefore in this Treatise, that the least assurance of those things, which are believed, is wanting to the Popish Religion; and that all things are there doubtful, all things uncertain, and nothing firm. This altho it be most true in the Agenda *also of their Religion; yet to avoid prolixity I confined my self to the* Credenda *only, and even in these omitted many things, which might perhaps seem not inconsiderable to many. For not one or two ways only doth the Roman Religion overthrow the firmness of Faith: It doth it upon many accounts, principally by their Doctrine of the Eucharist, which introduces an universal Scepticism into the whole System of Christian Religion: Not to say, that their Divines in teaching that the very Existence of God is not so much known as believed, manifestly betray to Atheists the Cause of Religion. But I omit these things, as not properly belonging to the matter by us undertaken. What I offer in this Discourse may perhaps seem to some too much embarassed with Scholastick Terms and Disputes: Nor indeed do I wholly deny it. But I desire those Persons to consider, whether this could possibly be avoided. For only to propose our Arguments, and not vindicate them by examining what is opposed to them by our Adversaries, seemeth to me the least part of an accurate Disputation; Which whosoever shall peruse, even with the greatest diligence and attention, cannot nor ought not to give sentence; because they have not yet heard the other party, whose defence cannot be without injustice neglected. Those defences indeed are become nauseous in this Age, and not undeservedly: But however they could not be justly passed by and dissembled by us. Yet in these I have endeavoured to propose them as clearly and perspicuously as I could, and accommodate them to the capacity of all persons. Whether I have gained my intent experience must declare.*

OF

OF THE INCURABLE SCEPTICISM OF THE *CHURCH* of *ROME*.

CHAP. I.

Wherein is laid down the Design of this Treatise; and some things are premised for the better understanding of the whole.

IT is acknowledged by all, that the perfection of that Faith, which the Schoolmen call *Inform*, we *Historical*, consists in three things, that it be plenary, pure, and firm; that is, that it believeth all which God hath revealed; and that without any mixture of errour, or admittance of doubt. That the Faith of Papists is neither plenary nor pure many have demonstrated: That it is not firm or unshaken I here undertake to prove; and to shew, that admitting their Hypotheses, a Papist cannot with a certain and firm Faith be perswaded of the truth of any thing; not only not of those Articles, which *Rome* hath added to the Divine Revelation, but not even of those, which were truly revealed by God.

For since Objects of Faith are inevident of themselves, and deserve assent no otherwise, then as it shall appear that they have been revealed by God; and Revelation it self not a whit more evident: there is necessarily required one or more Rules, whereby things Revealed may be distinguished from not Revealed. We have only one such Rule, the Holy Scriptures: The Papists many, that so what they want in goodness, they may make up in number. For to Scripture they have added Tradition, Decrees of Popes, Constitutions of Councils and consent of Pastors, not only those who have successively ruled the Church from the first foundation of it, but of those also who govern at any determinate time; and lastly the belief of the whole Church.

Now that by the means of any Rule our Faith may become firm, two things are neceſſary: Firſt that the Rule it ſelf be true, containing nothing falſe or not revealed: And then Secondly, that what we believe manifeſtly agree with this Rule. If either of theſe conditions fail; our Faith muſt be uncertain. Nor is it only requiſite, that a Papiſt be aſcertained both of the truth of the Rules of his Faith, and the conformity of what he believe unto them: But alſo that he be as firmly perſwaded of the truth of theſe things, as he is of the truth of any Article of his Faith. For ſince the Faith of Papiſts depends wholly upon theſe Rules, and is ſuſtained only by them: How can it be, that the perſwaſion of the truth of thoſe things, which they believe meerly for the ſake of theſe Rules, ſhould be more firm, than the perſwaſion of the truth of the Rules themſelves, or of the conformity of what they believe unto thoſe Rules? It being impoſſible, that an Effect ſhould have more in it, than the Cauſe can give it: A Concluſion ſtronger than the Premiſes; or a Houſe firmer than the Foundations. Nor do our Adverſaries deny this. *Holden* [1] affirms, that *whatſoever certainty we can attribute to an aſſent of the underſtanding given for the ſake of the authority of God revealing: The ſame muſt neceſſarily be derived from, and depend upon the certainty of the means, whereby the authority of God revealing is communicated to the underſtanding*: And that *it is impoſſible, that any one ſhould believe thoſe things which are ſaid to be revealed by God with a greater degree of true and rational certainty, than wherewith he is aſſured, that God did reveal them.* *Ægidius Eſtrix* [2] layeth down and proveth theſe three Aſſertions. 1. *That an Aſſent of Faith cannot be more certain than the Principles upon which it depends.* 2. *That it cannot be more firm than thoſe previous Aſſents from which it is deduced.* 3. *That that which is otherwiſe, is an imprudent aſſent.* And *John Martinonus* [3] to the ſame purpoſe writeth, *That ſupernatural Faith cannot with a formal certainty taken from the merit of the object exceed the certainty of thoſe truths, which are included in its object, and in which that certainty is founded.*

[1] *Quamcunque enim certitudinem attribuere poſſumus aſſenſui intellectûs propter authoritatem Dei revelantis elicito, eam neceſſe eſt provenire ac dependere à certitudine medii, quo hæc Dei revelantis authoritas intellectui communicatur.* ——— *Impoſſibile eſt, ut majori certitudine verâ & rationali credat aliquis ea quæ dicuntur à Deo revelari, quàm quâ cognoverit Deum eâ revelaſſe.* Holden. Anal. Fid. lib. 1. cap. 2.

[2] Eſt. Diat. *de Sapientiâ Dei, &c.* Aſſert. 26, 27, 28.

[3] *Non poteſt fides ſupernaturalis ſuperare formali certitudine ſumptâ ex merito objecti certitudinem earum veritatum, quæ includuntur in ipſius objecto, & in quibus fundatur illa certitudo.* Mart. Tom. 5. diſp. 2c. *de Fide* Sect. 8.

Since

Since therefore the perſwaſion which Papiſts have of what they believe, either is, or is thought to be, Divine Faith: It hence appears that it cannot be ſolid, unleſs they be aſſured by Divine Faith, or ſome other not inferior perſwaſion, that both the Rules of their Faith are true, and that what they believe is entirely conformable to them. This our Adverſaries confeſs: And becauſe ſome of them hold, that no perſwaſion is of equal certainty with Divine Faith; therefore it is neceſſary, that by Divine Faith they be aſcertained of thoſe two things, or at leaſt the firſt of them. So *Ludovicus Caſpenſis* [4] *Unleſs we can believe*, ſaith he, *by Divine Faith that ſuch and ſuch Popes are Succeſſors of* Peter; *there is nothing we can believe by Divine Faith.* Martinonus [5] affirms that *the Pope could not oblige us to believe* de fide, *that which he defineth as ſaid by God; unleſs it were* de fide, *that he hath the Power of defining, and infallible aſſiſtance.* *Maimburgh* [6] hath much to the ſame ſence which would be here too long to inſert.

[4] *Niſi fide divinâ credamus ejuſmodi Pontifices eſſe ſucceſſores* Petri, *nihil eſt quod poſſimus fide divinâ credere.* Lud. Caſp. *de fide*, diſp. 2. Sect. 6.

[5] *Neque ſummus Pontifex poſſet nos obligare ad credendum de fide, id quod definit ut dictum à Deo: niſi de fide eſſet ipſum habere poteſtatem definiendi & infallibilem aſſiſtentiam.* Mart. *de fide* diſp. 9. Sect. 6.

[6] Maimb. *de la vraye parole*, Chap. 3.

If the opinion of theſe Divines were received by all, the Diſpute would be the ſhorter. For then I need only prove, that none of our Adverſaries is by Divine Faith aſſured of the certainty of the foundations of his Faith: Since all other kind of aſſurance, being inferior to that of Divine Faith, would not ſuffice. But becauſe this Hypotheſis, although admitted by moſt, is denied by ſome few; and labours with inſuperable difficulties, which I will not here touch. I will not have the force of my argument rely upon it. It remains therefore to be inquired, whether our Adverſaries can boaſt of any certainty in this matter diſtinct from, and as they think, not inferior to the certainty of Divine Faith. But firſt we muſt lay down ſomewhat concerning the kinds and degrees of certainty. *Bellarmine* [7] makes a two fold certainty, Evident, and Obſcure; that of things in themſelves manifeſt, this of things that depend upon external proofs and teſtimonies. To the firſt kind he aſſigneth three degrees: whereof firſt Principles conſtitute the firſt; Concluſions evidently drawn from theſe, the ſecond; and things perceived by ſenſe the third: That is certainty of the Intellect, of Science, and of Experience. To Obſcure Certainty he giveth as many degrees.

[7] De Juſtif. lib. 3. cap. 2.

The

The first is of those things which are believed for Divine Authority: The second of those believed upon the account of humane authority, but that so illustrious, that it leaveth no place for doubt; the third of those things which are confirmed by such and so many arguments, as may exclude anxiety, but not distrust: Or certainty of Divine Faith, which is absolute, certainty of Humane Faith, which is Moral, and certainty of opinion, which is conjectural. Thus far *Bellarmine*, whose distribution of the kinds of Certainty might be allowed: if the raising a conjectural opinion, even to the lowest degree of it, were not too improper and irrational. But to pass by that, this rather deserveth notice, that he hath made no mention of that kind of certainty, which is so famous in the Schools, as neither wholly evident, nor wholly obscure, but mixt of both. Such have Theological Conclusions; which are deduced from two propositions, the one evident, the other revealed.

It need not much be inquired; whether our Adversaries have this last certainty of the firmness of the foundations of their Faith. For it is either of the same kind with the certainty of Faith, or of a diverse. If of the same, as some will, then to prove, that our Adversaries have not herein the certainty of Divine Faith, will disprove this. If of a diverse, as most think, then it is inferior to the other, and less firm; and consequently not sufficient. Besides such who think, that these Theological Conclusions founded upon a mixt certainty, are *de fide*, as *Alphonsus a Castro*, and *Melchior Canus*, must acknowledg that their opinion, oppugned by so many and so great Divines of the same party, cannot be certain. But an incertain opinion, though true in it self, cannot be the foundation of an undoubted certainty, such as is that of Divine Faith. Lastly whether this certainty be, or be not, inferior to that of Divine Faith; it can have no place here but absurdly and preposterously. For all this certainty is derived from things revealed; and cannot therefore add any to things revealed. Theological Conclusions are admitted only for the sake of those revealed Propositions, from which they are deduced. Those Propositions therefore cannot be admitted for the sake of these Conclusions, without a manifest and absurd Circle.

I do not remember, that any of our Adversaries have assigned a Conjectural Certainty to the perswasion which they have of the

the Truth of the Rules of their Faith. And ſurely ſuch Certainty would be too mean and inconſiderable for this place: Belonging to Opinion rather than Faith, as *Bellarmine* well notes; and not excluding diſtruſt, which is abſolutely deſtructive of Divine Faith.

A Moral Certainty is rarely made uſe of by our Adverſaries in this caſe; being ſuch as take place only in matters of fact, and not all thoſe neither, but only ſuch as are perceived by the ſenſes of other men, and thoſe, ſo many and ſo clearly, as take away all ſuſpicion either of fraud or errour. Whereas thoſe parts of a Papiſts belief, which have moſt need of being backed by certainty; and are ſubject to the greateſt difficulties, are matters of right; or at leaſt ſuch as fall not under the ſenſes either of himſelf or others. There are ſome things indeed, which they would have to be manifeſt by this kind of certainty, ſuch as the knowledg of a lawful Pope, or a Canonical Council, what the preſent Church teacheth, or to which Society belong the notes of a true Church, *&c.* We muſt conſider therefore, whether in theſe caſes this certainty be ſufficient. It would ſuffice indeed, if the opinions of *Bagotius* or *Huetius* were admitted: Of whom the firſt equals, the ſecond prefers Moral Certainty to Metaphyſical, and even that which is acquired by demonſtration. But few approve theſe exceſſes: Many on the contrary depreſs this certainty too low. However all agree, that it is inferior to that of Divine Faith. For which reaſon alone I might reject it, but ſhall notwithſtanding be content only then to do it, when it is falſly pretended.

As for an evident certainty our Adverſaries, neither do, nor can glory in it. For if the foundations of Faith had that: No previous motion of the will by the Divine influence, no ſupernatural aſſiſtance of grace would be neceſſary; which yet all require; and none but fools and ſtupid perſons could be disbelievers. Beſides, that thoſe things which are of poſitive right, and depend upon the free Will of God, cannot be taught by nature, but muſt be known only by Divine Revelation. But herein our Adverſaries conſent to us, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, and preſume not to boaſt of evidence in the Objects of their Belief.

There remains therefore only the certainty of Divine Faith, which they can pretend to. Wherefore I ſhall chiefly conſider

that; not neglecting yet the reſt, whenſoever it can be imagined that they may be made uſe of by our Adverſaries: omitting only the certainty of Theological Concluſions, and that for the reaſons beforementioned. I ſhall now examine all the Foundations of Faith which our Adverſaries are wont to produce; beginning at the Holy Scriptures.

CHAP. II.

That the Faith of Papiſts is not founded on Holy Scripture.

THAT the Scripture is moſt certain in it ſelf, and moſt fit to ground our Faith upon is our conſtant belief and profeſſion. But this cannot ſuffice our Adverſaries, unleſs they recede from their known Principles. The Scripture may be conſidered and uſed for the eſtabliſhing of our Faith two ways: Firſt as it is in it ſelf, and its own nature: and Secondly as it is confirmed, illuſtrated, and aſſiſted by the help of Tradition, and the authority of the Church. That Scripture, the firſt way conſidered is not a fit foundation of our Faith, our Adverſaries not only freely confeſs but ſharply contend: maintaining that, laying aſide Tradition and the Church, we cannot be aſſured either that Scripture is the Word of God, or conſiſts of ſuch Books and Chapters, or that they are delivered incorrupted to us, or faithfully tranſlated; or that this, or that is the ſenſe of ſuch a place. Of theſe opinions and arguments their Authors are agreed, their Books are full: that ſhould I recite but the names, much more the teſtimonies of the maintainers of them; I ſhould become voluminous.

To this may be oppoſed, that this is only the opinion of the School Divines and Controverſial Writers: that there are many in the Church of *Rome*, who believe the authority of the Scripture independent from the judgment of the Church, and dextrouſly uſe that method of arguing againſt Atheiſts; as *Huetius* in his Books of *Evangelical Demonſtration*, and the Anonymous Author of *the Diſſertation concerning the arguments, wherewith the truth*

truth of Moſes *his Writings may be demonſtrated*: that ſuch as theſe may have a true and firm belief of thoſe things which Scripture plainly teacheth; which are all, that are neceſſary to be believed.

Whileſt I congratulate to the Church of *Rome* theſe more ſober Proſylites, and wiſh that by a general concurrence therein they would refute my Diſſertation: I obſerve, firſt, that there are very few among them of this opinion. Secondly that it doth not appear, that even theſe few are perſwaded that their arguments ſuffice to found a Divine Faith upon the Scriptures demonſtrated by them. The Licenſers and Approvers of the aforementioned Diſſertation ſeemed to be afraid of this; while they manifeſtly diſtinguiſh a perſwaſion ariſing from thoſe arguments, from true Faith. Laſtly that it doth not appear, whether they think that they can without the authority of the Church be obliged to believe, either which are Canonical Books, or what is the ſenſe of thoſe Books. So that until they declare their mind herein, they are not by us to be disjoined from, much leſs oppoſed to the reſt.

I may therefore take it for granted, that according to our Adverſaries the Faith of private men cannot relie upon the Scripture deſtitute of the aſſiſtance of Tradition: ſince it is what themſelves moſt of all contend for. Now for what concerneth Scripture conſidered the latter way, as it is fortified by the accedaneous help of Church and Tradition; I might perhaps omit the handling of it here; foraſmuch as neither Church nor Tradition can confer a greater degree of firmneſs upon Scripture; which that they have not themſelves, I ſhall in the proceeding of this Diſcourſe more opportunely ſhew hereafter. However becauſe ſome few things occur not improper for this place; I ſhall very briefly ſpeak of them.

Firſt then how little help there is for Scripture in Tradition, appeareth hence; that it can no otherwiſe teach what is the true ſenſe of Scripture, but by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers: which whether it be to be had in any one text of Scripture, may be much doubted. It was a hard condition therefore, which Pope *Pius* IV. preſcribed, in his Profeſſion of Faith, to all which deſired admiſſion into the Church of *Rome*, and which may for ever ſilence all the *Roman* Commentators: *that they will never receive nor interpret Scripture any otherwiſe, than according to the unanimous conſent*

[1] *Nec eam unquam niſi juxta unanimem conſenſum patrum accipiam & interpretabor.*

of the Fathers. Now I would fain know, how this Law can be observed: since I may confidently affirm, that there is no one place of Scripture explained the same way by all the Fathers. For there are many places, which none of them have touched; and none, which all have interpreted. Nor will it suffice to say, that they agree, who have interpreted it, and that the silence of the rest is to be taken for consent: as if they must be supposed to consent, who were ignorant of such interpretations, or dead perhaps before they were made, or as if the Antients were wont expressly to reject all interpretations different from their own; or these might not be rejected, or at least others proposed, in those Books of the Fathers, which are lost. It is not enough therefore to have the consent of a few; unless we be assured of the concurrence of the rest. But granting that it is, it cannot be denied, that our Adversaries can collect nothing certain out of any place of Scripture, if any one of the Antients have interpreted it otherwise. Hence *Alphonsus a Castro* [2] requireth, that among the necessary qualifications of a Text of Scripture to be produced for the conviction of Hereticks, this be the chief; *that it be so plain and undoubted, that none of the sacred and approved Doctors interpret it in some other sence, according to which such a proposition cannot be thereby convinced of Heresie.* But if this be true; how few places will there be, of whose sense we may not doubt? Certainly there are very few explained the same way by all antient Commentators. This *Christopher Gillius* [3] Professor of *Conimbria*, acknowledgeth, who affirms *many places to be in Scripture, whose sense can be had neither from Tradition, nor from the Definition of the Church? neither yet can a concurrent explication of the Fathers be found, either because they were of different opinions, or because few explained the place.* And the Anonymous Writer of *the Treatise of the Liberties of the Gallican Church* [4] maintains, that there is few places of Scripture, which the Holy Fathers have not differently interpreted. As will also manifestly appear to any one, who shall consult those Interpreters, that are wont to produce the expositions of the Antient Writers.

[2] — *Itaqui certum & indubitatum, ut nullus ex sacris & probatis Doctoribus illud in aliquo alio sensu interpretetur, juxta quem non possit talis propositio per illud de hæresi convinci.* Castr. *de justâ hæret. pun.* lib. 1. cap. 4.

[3] *Multa sunt in sacris literis, quorum sententia neque ex Traditione, neque ex Ecclesiæ definitione habetur.* —— *neque semper communis (Sanctorum) sententia reperitur; vel quia diversa sentiunt, vel quia pauci locum aliquem interpretati sunt.* Gill. *de doctr. sacrâ* lib. 1. Tract. 7. cap. 6.

[4] *Pauca sunt (Scripturæ loca) quæ SS. Patres varii variè interpretati non fuerint.* lib. 3. cap. 11.

Hence

Hence the Readers may imagine, to what a ſtreight our Adverſaries would be reduced; if they were tied up to their own Laws, and allowed to urge no other places of Scripture againſt us, than what are unanimouſly interpreted by the Fathers. A Specimen hereof may be found in *Launoy*, where he weigheth the Texts of Scripture produced by *Bellarmine* for the Popes authority; and ſhewing that they are diverſly explained by the Antients, concludeth thence, that they are wholly ineffectual.

That the ſenſe of Scripture cannot be learned from Tradition, hence appeareth: but neither is it taught any better by the Church. At leaſt She hath not yet taught it. For how many Decrees of the Church is there about the true ſenſe of Scriptures. Decrees I ſay: for not every ſimple explication or allegation of a Text is to be lookt upon as an authentick interpretation of it; but only that which hath an Anathema affixed to the deniers of it, or diſſenters from it. Of this kind I find but four or five in the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*, and in thoſe of elder Councils none at all. For 1500 years the Church delivered not the ſenſe of ſo much as one place: whence may be judged, both what a faithful Interpreter She is of the Holy Scriptures! and how ſmall an aſſiſtance we are to expect from her in obtaining the true ſenſe of them.

CHAP. III.

That Tradition is no better ground for the Papiſts Faith, than Holy Scriptures.

THUS have we taken from our Adverſaries the firſt and chief foundation of Divine Faith. The Second will be as eaſily removed. I mean Tradition; which may be conſidered two ways, as well as Scripture; either as it is in it ſelf, or as it is confirmed by the authority of the Church. That it hath no force the firſt way conſidered, *Bellarmine* [1] expreſly acknowledgeth, affirming that *till we certainly know what is the true Church, Scripture, Tradition, and all matters*

[1] *Scriptura, Traditiones, & omnia plane dogmata, niſi certiſſimi ſimus, quæ ſit vera Eccleſia, incerta prorſus erunt; omnia.* Bell. *de Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 10.

ters of belief are utterly uncertain. That *Bellarmin* is in the right herein, at leaſt as to what concerns Tradition, is manifeſt by theſe two reaſons.

Firſt, that taking away the atteſtation of the Church, it cannot be known, that there is any Divine Traditions. For laying aſide that, how ſhall we know, that there is any unwritten Word of God derived down to us? From Tradition? that cannot be, ſince we are now doubting, whether there be any Tradition. From Scripture? That favours not Tradition: but if it did, it would avail nothing; ſince as we ſhew in the foregoing Chapter, Scripture according to our Adverſaries cannot obtain belief; till it be it ſelf confirmed by Tradition and the Church. Thus doth the truth of Tradition remain uncertain, unleſs it be ſuſtained by the Churches authority. *Gregory a Valentia* [2] well knew this, who puts Tradition into the ſame condition with Scripture; *neither being of authority when called in doubt, unleſs confirmed by ſome other certain authority.*

[2] *Sicut de authoritate ipſius Scripturæ neceſſe per aliquam aliam certam authoritatem conſtare; ita etiam de auctoritate Traditionis, ſi ea quoque revocetur in dubium.* Val. Tom. 3. diſp. 1. quæſt. 1. punct. 7. § 12.

Secondly, granting that it may be known, that there are Divine Traditions, it cannot yet without the authority of the Church be known, which they are: ſo many falſe, dubious and ſuſpected Traditions being carried about; each of which pretends to the ſame Character of Divine Authority. The teſtimonies of the Fathers will not help in this caſe: ſince even their judgment is dubious, and in many things it cannot eaſily be told, what was their opinion. Thus *Valentia* [3] confeſſeth that *Tradition being conſerved in the Writings of the Orthodox Doctors is as dubious and uncertain, as the opinion of thoſe Doctors is: and that the doubts raiſed concerning it cannot be defined by Tradition it ſelf.* In like manner *George Rhodius* [4] affirms that *no Tradition can be known to be true; unleſs ſome living Rule ſhall ſo define it.* But that this matter, being of no ſmall moment, may be the more manifeſt; we may obſerve that our Adverſaries require two things to make the teſtimony of the Fathers worthy to be relied on. Firſt that they

[3] *Cum Traditio ſcriptis ferè Doctorum Orthod. in Eccleſiâ conſervetur; quæſtiones ac dubia moveri poſſunt de ſenſu illius, ſicut dubitatur ſæpe de ſenſu ac mente Doctorum. Ejuſmodi autem quæſtiones— per eandem ipſam Traditionem definiri ſatis non poterunt.* Val. loc. cit.

[4] *Neque ſcire potero Traditionem aliquam eſſe veram; niſi vivens regula, id definierit.* Rhod. *de fide* quæſt. 2. Sect. 5. § 1.

they consent; and secondly that they do not meerly propose what seems most true to themselves; but testifie moreover that what they teach, was either delivered by Christ, or is of Faith, or, which is all one, the opposite of it, heresie. If either of these fail, then their testimony is not secure. The first condition is required by many and particularly by *Alphonsus a Castro*, [5] who enquiring out the ways, whereby a proposition may be convinced to be heretical; in the fourth place assigns *the unanimous consent of all the Fathers, who have written upon that argument.* The latter condition is made necessary by many more. *Driedo* [6] tells us the authority of the Fathers is of no value *any otherwise than as they demonstrate their opinion either from the Canonical Scriptures, or the belief of the universal Church since the Apostles times; and that they do not always deliver their sense as matters of Faith: but by way of judgement, opinion, and probable reason.* Stapleton [7] writeth that *this authority is not allowed to all the sayings of the Fathers, but either as they relate the publick belief of the Church, or have been approved and received by the Church. Gillius* [8] lastly grants, that *the testimony of Fathers and Doctors unanimously asserting somewhat pertaining to Faith and Divinity, if they simply assert it, and do withall tell us it is an Article of Faith, ought to be a firm Argument to a Divine, but without infallibity of Faith.*

[5] *Quarta est omnium SS. Doctorum, qui de re illâ scripserunt, concors sententia.* Castr. *de justâ hæret. pun.* lib. 1. cap. 4.

[6] *Non quia Hieronymus, sic vel sic docet, non quia Augustinus, &c.* Dried. de Eccles. Dogm. lib. 4. cap. 1. 6.

[7] *Non enim omnibus eorum dictis hæc authoritas datur; sed quatenus vel Ecclesiæ publicam fidem referunt, vel ab Ecclesiâ Dei recepta & approbata sunt.* Stapl de princip. doctr. lib 7. cap. 15.

[8] *Testimonium, Patrum vel Doctorum Scholasticorum communiter asserentium aliquid ad fidem vel Theologiam pertinens, simpliciter tamen, & non indicando esse dogma fidei, esse debet argumentum firmum Theologo, sed citra infallibilitatem fidei.* Gill. de doctr. Sacrâ lib. 1. Tract. 7. cap. 13.

Both conditions are required by *Canus*, [9] and *Bannes* [10] who laying down Rules, whereby true Traditions may be discerned from false; both assign this in the second place and in the same words: *If the Fathers have unanimously from the beginning, all along the Succession of their times, held any Article of Faith, and refuted the contrary as heretical, Bellarmine* and *Gretser* [11] give this for their fourth Rule. *When all the Doctors of the Church teach any thing by common consent*

[9] Can. Loc. Theol. lib. 3. cap. 4.

[10] Bann. *in* 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. *Si quod dogma fidei Patres ab initio secundum suorum temporum successiones concordissimè tenuerunt, hujusque contrarium ut hæreticum refutârunt,*

[11] Bell. & Gretz. *de verbo Dei* lib. 4. cap. 9.

ſent to have deſcended from Apoſtolical Tradition, either gathered together in a Council, or each one a part in their Writings. Suarez[12] writeth, that *although the Fathers and Schoolmen agree in any opinion not aſſerting it to be of Faith: But delivering their Judgment in it, they will not make it to be of Faith, becauſe they remain always within the limits of humane autherity.* Filliutius[13] reckoning up the ſeven degrees of things pertaining to Catholick verity, aſſigns the Sixth degree to *thoſe truths, which by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers are propoſed to be of Faith.* Martinonus[14] that *none of the Holy Fathers or Doctors taken ſeparately is the Rule of Faith; nor all yet together conjunctly, unleſs they aſſert their common opinion to be of Faith, and not meerly propoſe their own judgment.* Laſtly *Natalis Alexander*[15] affirms, that *when all the Fathers conſpire in the ſame opinion, defend it, and propoſe it as Apoſtolick Doctrine, and an Article of the Church to be believed by Catholick Faith: Then doth their authority afford a neceſſary argument of Sacred Doctrine*

[12] *Licet Patres vel Scholaſtici in aliquâ ſententiâ conveniant, non aſſerendo illam eſſe de fide, ſed judicium ſuum in eâ proferendo, non faciens rem de fide; quia ſemper manent intra menſuram autboritatis humanæ.* Suarez *de fide* diſp. 2. Sect. 6.

[13] —*quæ unanimi conſenſu Patrum tanquam de fide proponuntur.* Fill. *in* Decal. Tract. 22. cap. 1.

[14] *Certum eſt nullum ex SS. Patribus vel Doctoribus ſeorſim ſumptum eſſe Regulam Fidei, —jam de eorundem ſimul ſumptorum conſenſu diſtinguendum. Vel enim loquuntur ex proprio ſenſu, non aſſerendo rem tanquam de fide, & judicium ſuum de eâ proferendo; & ſic non Regula Fidei.* Mart. *de fide* diſp. 8. Sect. 3.

[15] *Cum omnes Patres in eandem ſententiam conſpirant, eamque propugnant, ac proponunt, ut Apoſtolicam doctrinam, & Eccleſiæ dogma Catholicâ fide credendum: tunc eorum authoritas neceſſarium argumentum ſacræ doctrinæ ſubminiſtrat.* Alex. ſæcul. 2 p. 1022.

Thus far theſe Writers: And that the reſt do not diſagree from them we ſhall ſoon be perſwaded; if we conſider, how unlikely it is, that a greater infallibility ſhould be allowed even to an unanimous teſtimony of the Fathers; than to Pope, or Council, or both together, or the preſent Univerſal Church: All which our Adverſaries grant may erre in thoſe things which they ſimply affirm or teach, and define not to be of Faith.

It ſufficeth not therefore, either that many Fathers deliver an opinion as of Faith; or that all ſhould ſimply teach it, but not affirm it to be of Faith. Now if theſe two conditions be obſerved; How few Articles of Chriſtian Faith ſhall we receive from Tradition? For the Fathers ſeldom all agree, and more rarely admoniſheth us, that what they teach, is of Faith. So that if you take away all Articles, wherein either of theſe conditions is wanting; it may well be doubted, whether any one

one will remain. Certainly if our Controverſial Divines ſhould ſo far make uſe of this obſervation, as to reject all teſtimonies of the Fathers produced by our Adverſaries againſt us, with which themſelves will not be obliged, that is, ſuch as are deficient in either of the conditions before laid down: They would be reduced to ſilence, and not have one authority left to boaſt of.

From what hath been ſaid, it appears that matters of Tradition and belief cannot be learned from the Fathers. Hence *Ægidius Eſtrix* [16] vehemently inveighs againſt *Peter-Van Buſcum* a Divine of *Gaunt*; who in his *Inſtruction* had remitted young Divines to the Fathers to learn the Chriſtian Doctrine from them. And *Nuetus* the Jeſuite likens thoſe Writers of Controverſie, who paſſing by the Scripture betake themſelves to the Fathers, to Thieves and Rogues, who deſerting the Cities, flee into thick Woods, that they may more ſecurely hide themſelves.

[16] Eſt. Apol. Sect. 4.

[17] Nuet. *adv.* Claud. *de Euchariſt. in præfat.*

If the Fathers therefore teach not Tradition; there remains only the Church, whence it can be known. Whether the Church therefore hath that power, as to confer the deſired Certainty upon what She pronounceth to be revealed and to be believed, is next to be inquired. Which, becauſe our Adverſaries here chiefly faſten their hold, eaſily giving up the former means of conveying Tradition; ſhall be ſomewhat more accurately diſcuſſed.

CHAP. IV.

That the Faith of Papiſts cannot be founded even upon the Definitive Judgment of the Church.

Firſt becauſe it is neither evident, nor of Faith, that the Judgment of the Church is certain.

BY the name of Church, whereon our Adverſaries would have the Faith of all men to be founded, they are wont to deſign two things. Firſt that viſible Congregation of men,

which conſiſts of Pope, Clergy, and Laicks; all profeſſing the ſame Faith. Secondly that part of this firſt Church, whoſe office it is to Rule the reſt, and preſcribe Laws of acting and believing to them: Whether this part be the Pope, or a Council. The former they call the Univerſal, the latter the Repreſentative or the Regent Church. To both they aſcribe infallibility, but in a different way; to the firſt in believing, to the ſecond in defining, or as they chuſe to ſpeak, in propoſing. So that whatſoever the Univerſal Church believeth, or the Repreſentative propoſeth to be believed, muſt neceſſarily be true, and revealed by God; and the denial of it, hereſie. We ſhall examine each in order: But firſt of the Repreſentative Church.

Our Adverſaries believe to have been inſtituted by God a living and viſible Authority, whoſe office it ſhould be to define matters of belief and practice, infallibly determine emergent Controverſies, and judge of Hereſie. That whatſoever this power, which ſome call the *Chair*, others more accurately the *Tribunal*, defineth, propoſeth, or judgeth; may and ought to be received of all Chriſtians as an Article of Faith: and that this is the ordinary and immediate foundation of the Faith of private Chriſtians. Indeed in aſſigning this Tribunal, what and where it is, all do not agree. But that there is ſuch an one, whatſoever it is, all do contend. Whether there be ſuch an one, is a great queſtion, and may juſtly take up another Diſcourſe. But now we only conſider, whether the judgment and definition of this Tribunal be ſuch, as that whoſoever relyeth upon it, can or ought to be certain, that he doth not err, and that what he believes, is true. For it is not enough that this Tribunal be infallible, unleſs its infallibity be alſo manifeſt. Since if it had ſuch a priviledge, but either unknown or uncertain; he indeed, that acquieſced in its definitions, would not err, but could never be certain, that he doth not err, and might reaſonably doubt, whether he doth or no. I enquire therefore, whether our Adverſaries can be certain that the Church in defining cannot err.

If the Papiſts have any certainty of the infallibility of the Church defining; it muſt be either Moral, or evident, or that of Divine Faith: For the reſt we have excluded before. But it can be none of theſe: Not Moral, for that depends upon the

the teſtimony of anothers ſenſes: But the Infallibility of the Church cannot be perceived either by our own, or by anothers ſenſes. Nor indeed is it here pretended to by our Adverſaries: No more than Evident Certainty, which they expreſly acknowledge they have not herein. So *Andrew du Val* [1] tells us *The Infallibility of the Church can be certainly known only by Divine Revelation.* *Arriaga* [2] that *it is not a Truth known by it ſelf, or ſelf evident.* *Conink* [3] that *it is known to us only by Faith from the teſtimony of the Scriptures*, and *ſerveth to direct only the Faithful.* *Yſambertus* [4] that *it cannot be known infallibly by men, otherwiſe than by Divine Revelation.* *Rhodius* [5] that *it is known only by Divine Faith.* Laſtly *Antonius Arnaldus* [6] that *it is not ſelf evident.*

[1] *Non poteſt firmiter & infallibiliter ſciri niſi ex Divinâ Revelatione*, Du Val in 2. 2. pag. 16.

[2] *Non eſt veritas per ſe nota*, Arr. *de Fide* Diſp 3. Sect. 1.

[3] *Solâ Fide ex Scripturæ teſtimonio conſtat; ſolos fideles dirigit.* Con. *de act.* Cupern. Diſp. 9. dub. 5.

[4] *Non poteſt ſciri ab hominibus infallibiliter, niſi ex divinâ revelatione.* Yſamb. *de Fide* Diſp. 26. art. 2.

[5] *Cognoſcitur tantùm Fide divinâ.* Rhod. *de Fide* quæſt. 1. Sect 4. §. 4.

[6] *Non eſt quid ex ſe evidens.* Arn. Perpert. *de la Foy*, liv. 1. chap. 7.

The whole matter therefore comes to this, whether the Infallibility of the Church be of Faith. That it is our Adverſaries, as we ſee, pretend; that it is not, I prove many ways. Firſt this ſeems to be the opinion of a man of great Name among them, *Launoy*, who every where oppugneth the Infallability of the Pope, and ſheweth that the Infallibility of a Council appears to him not to be of Faith; while he ſaith [7] that *although it be certain the priviledge of not erring is in a Council; yet that it is far more certain among Divines that it is in the Church*: Which he would never have ſaid, if he had believed the Infallibility of a Council to be of Faith. For then it would be no leſs certain than the Infallibility of the Church.

[7] *Quamvis certum ſit non errandi privilegium ineſſe Concilio, longè tamen certius eſt apud Theologos Eccleſia ineſſe.* Laun. Epiſt. *ad* Vallant. Tom. 2. 1

Beſides it is the common opinion of our Adverſaries; that nothing is of Faith, of which Diſputes are raiſed in the boſom of the Church, She being conſcious of them. Thus *Holden* [8] affirms, *that is not an Article of Divine and Catholick Faith; whoſe oppoſite is publickly maintained by many pious and learned Catholicks,*

[8] *Certum eſt illud non eſſe Fidei divinæ & Catholicæ dogma, cujus oppoſitum a plurimis piiſſimis & doctiſſimis Catholicis viris publicè ſuſtentari videmus, ſciente nimirum & patente Eccleſiâ univerſâ.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 9.

the Universal Church knowing of it, and winking at it. To the same purpose *Canus* [9] teacheth, that *if the opinion of one or a few be not rejected by the Church; then the* (contrary) *authority of many will produce nothing firm or certain.* There is extant among the works of the *Fratres Valemburgii* a Treatise called the *Rule of Faith*, written formerly in French by *Veron*, and translated into Latine by the *Valemburgii*, and so openly adopted by them, that whatsoever *Veron* writ of himself in the singular, they translate in the plural. So that whatsoever is contained in it, may be lookt upon as the sense of all three Writers. Now the chief scope of this Book is to shew, that not a few opinions taught by many of their Doctors, and by us affixed to the whole Church of *Rome*, are not of Faith, but may be safely denied. To the obtaining of this end they make use chiefly of two means, the silence of the Council of *Trent*, and the testimonies of Doctors of a contrary opinion: and Section 15. [10] have these words, That *the different judgement of the Doctors herein may alone suffice to prove, that it is not of Faith.* Upon this foundation proceed all those Divines; who maintain that the Pope is infallible, or superiour to a Council. Thus the *Valemburgii* [11] write, that *for this cause only, they will not affirm this proposition to be of Catholick Faith, because Authors of the contrary opinion are not condemned by the Church for Hereticks.* So *Bannes* [12], *Bellarmine* [13], *Vasquez* [14], and *Duval* [15] tells us, that *they will not assert the contrary opinion to be heresie; because it is not yet condemned by Popes or Councils, and is tolerated in the Church.* But *Gillius* [16] goes farther, and reprehendeth *Bannes* for inflicting even a mark of rashness upon the opinion of one only sense of Scripture, since four Divines, *Alensis*, *Albertus*, *Henricus*, and *Medina* had defended it.

[9] Sunius *aut paucorum opinatio non fuerit ab Ecclesiâ rejecta, tum plurimorum authoritas —— nihil certum firmumque conficiet.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 7. cap. 3.

[10] *Variæ sunt hâc de re Doctorum sententiæ; quod vel solum sufficit probando id non esse de fide Catholicâ.*

[11] *Eâ solùm de causâ non affirmamus hanc propositionem fide Catholicâ esse tenendam; quid Authores, qui contrariam sentiunt, nondum videamus ab Ecclesiâ damnatos pro hæreticis.* Val. Tom. 1. Tract. 1. Exam. 3. num. 111.

[12] Bann. *in* 2. 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. dub. 2.

[13] Bell. *de* Pont. lib. 4. cap. 2.

[14] Vasq. *in* 3. disp. 137. cap. 1.

[15] Duval. *in* 2. 2. p. 344.

[16] *Quare rigida videtur censura, quâ Bannes oppositam notat (sententiam) vocans eam temerariam.* Gill. *de* doctr. Sacrâ lib. 1. Tract. 7. cap. 4.

This opinion of our Adversaries is grounded on a double foundation. The first *Gillius* declareth in expres words, *viz.* that *it is not credible that so many learned and pious persons should either*

either not know what the Catholick Faith teacheth, or knowing it should oppose it. The Second is, that it would be a most unpardonable neglect of the Church to see the Faith torn in pieces by her Children, and be silent in so urgent an occasion. For by that connivance She should at least indirectly confirm heresie: it being a Rule of the Canon Law, [17] that an *Errour, which is not resisted, is approved.*

[17] *Error, cui non resistitur, approbatur,* Dist. 83.

If therefore I demonstrate, that not one or two, but many of the *Roman* Divines, and those the most celebrated, and by their merit preferred to the greatest dignities in the Church, were not only ignorant of, but also openly denied this Infallibility: I shall at the same time prove, that it is not of Faith. The former will easily be performed. For first, the most noble and learned *Jo. Fr. Picus* [18] Prince of *Mirandula* confesseth, that *their Doctors and Canonists are divided in their opinions, whether a Pope and Council conjunctly defining matters of Faith can err or not: and that we are not obliged to believe either opinon.* That *Picus* his testimony is true any one will be convinced, that considereth how many things repugnant to this Infallibility the greatest men of the *Roman* Church have taught. These may be reduced to four heads. First, the testimonies of those which teach that the Pope and Council (to whom alone this Infallibility is assigned) can err. Secondly, of those which deny that Church which is unerring and indefectible, to be so tied to the Clergy, that it may not wholly consist in others. Thirdly, of those who assert that the Faith of all men, one only excepted, may fail; and so the Church subsist in a single Laick or Woman. Fourthly of those who imagine that the Faith may perish in all adult persons, and so the Church consist only in baptized infants.

[18] *Voluerunt multi Concilium si unâ cum Pontifice in iis quæ ad essentiam fidei pertinent, sententiam ferat, nullo pacto errare posse. Restitere alii, affirmantes errare posse Concilia, & jam errâsse — nec adhuc aliquid (quod sciam) promulgatum est, cujus vi ad alterutrum credendum obstringamur.* Picus ad Theor. 4.

For the first we shall produce *Ockam*, or at least them, whose opinions he relates. (For in his Dialogues he never speaks in his own person) [19] He therefore affirms, that *it is rash to say a General Council cannot err against the Faith; that being the peculiar priviledge of the Church Militant.* That

[19] *Una sola est Ecclesia militans, quæ contra fidem errare non potest. — Temerarium est dicere, quod Concilium Generale contra fidem errare non potest.* Occam. Dial. part. 1. lib. 5. cap. 25.

the

[19] *the Scriptures, the Universal Church and the Apostles are without hesitation to be believed; but none others how eminent soever in holiness and Learning, no not a General Council, although the Universal Church were gathered together in it, nor the Decrees of Popes, nor the Judgments of Doctors.* Lastly [20] that *it belongs to every man skilful in the Scriptures, with a firm assurance to judge whether Councils have been celebrated Canonically, or defined Catholickly.*

Peter de Alliaco [21] Cardinal of *Cambray*, and one of the Presidents of the Council of *Constance*, layeth down these Three Assertions. 1. *That a General Council can depart from the Law of Christ.* 2. *That the Church of* Rome, *which is distinguished from the whole Congregation of the Faithful, as the part from the whole, may fall into Heresie.* 3. *That the whole multitude of Clergy and Laity may apostatize from the true Faith.* This Lecture opposed by a Parisian Doctor he afterwards largely defended in his Reply, which he Entitled *de Resumptâ*: Where among other things to this purpose he enquireth, what is to be done, when a General Council errs, and the State of Christendom is so depraved, that Hereticks have all the Power, the Faithful being become few and contemptible: And in this case adviseth to make divers Appeals, commit themselves to the Divine Grace, and bear the injury with Patience.

Waldensis [22] teacheth, that *the Church, which is the Infallible Rule of Faith, is neither Pope nor Council, which have sometimes erred; but the Series and Collection of all Doctors successively from the Apostles to our times. That neither an Episcopal Synod, nor the common decree of the Roman Church, nor yet a General Council of all the Bishops of the World, is that Catholick Symbolical Church, that can challenge assent*

[19] *Scripturæ divinæ, universali Ecclesiæ, & Apostolis absque allâ dubitatione in omnibus credendum. Nullis verò aliis, quantâcunque doctrinâ vel Sanctitate præpolleant,—— Ita quod nec in Concilio generali, si esset congregata universalis Ecclesia, nec Decretis Pontificum, nec Doctorum dictis est necessario credulitas in omni dicto absque omni exceptione præstanda.* Id. part. 3. Tract. 1. lib. 3. cap. 4.

[20] *Si quæratur, quis habet judicare, an Concilia fuerint Catholicè celebrata, respondetur quod periti in Scripturis habent judicare per modum firmæ assertionis, quod definita ab iis sunt Catholicè definita.* Id. cap. 19.

[21] 1. *Concilium generale potest dissentiri legi Christi.* 2. *Ecclesia Romana, quæ distinguitur a totâ congregatione fidelium, ut pars à toto, potest hæreticari.* 3. *Tota multitudo Clericorum & Laicorum virorum potest à fide deficere.* All. *in* quæst. vesper. art 3.

[22] *Non est ergo specialis Ecclesia, non Africana, nec utique particularis illa Romana, sed universalis Ecclesia, non quidem in generali Synodo congregata, quam aliquoties errâsse percepimus.* Sed est &c. Vald. doctr. Fid. Tom. 1. lib. 2. cap. 19. *Paulo post. Quia nulla harum (Synodi Episcopalis, &c.,) est Ecclesia Catholica Symbolica, nec vendicat sibi fidem dari sub pœnâ*

aſſent upon pain of infidelity: But the Univerſal ſucceſſion of the Holy Fathers throughout all Ages. That an unanimous conſent of the Fathers is to be preferred before the Decree of a General Council, although all the Biſhops of the World be therein. That Obedience is not ſo readily and intirely to be given to the dictates of any particular Church, or even to the authority of a General Council, as to the firſt Faith propoſed by Scripture, or the Symbolical Church of Chriſt: The other being to be regarded only as the inſtitution of the Elders, and paternal admonition.

perfidia. Sed &c. —Nec movere quenquam debet, quod talem concordem profeſſionem Patrum præpoſuit decreto generalis Concilii, etiamſi è toto orbe exiſtentes convenirent Epiſcopi. Et cap. 27. Nec tamen alicui jam dicta (Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis, maximè verò Romanæ, & authoritati Concilii Generalis) ita obediendum cenſeo, & tam pronâ fide, ſicut primæ fidei Scripturæ, vel Eccleſiæ Chriſti Symbolicæ, ſed ſicut inſtitutionibus Seniorum & monitioni paternæ.

Cardinal *Panormitan* [23] writeth, that *in things indeed concerning Faith a Council is above the Pope. Yet if the Pope be moved with better reaſons and authorities than the Council, we are to ſtand to his determination. For even a Council may err, and hath erred. That in matters of Faith the judgment even of one private man is to be preferred before the Sentence of the Pope; if he were moved with better Arguments drawn from the Old and New Teſtament, than the Pope.* And much more to the ſame purpoſe. *Antony* [24] Archbiſhop of *Florence* hath tranſcribed this whole paſſage of *Panormitan* into his ſum of Divinity without making the leaſt mention of him; and delivers it as his own opinion.

[23] *Ideo in concernentibus fidem Concilium eſt ſupra Papam —Puto tamen quod ſi Papa moveretur melioribus rationibus & authoritatibus quàm Concilium, quod ſtandum eſſet ſententiæ ſuæ. Nam & Concilium poteſt errare, ſicut aliàs erravit, &c —Nam in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati eſſet præferendum dicto Papæ, ſi ille moveretur melioribus rationibus N. & V. Teſtamenti quam Papa,* Panorm. *in* Cap. *Significaſti de electione.*

[24] Ant. Summ. Theol. part. 3. Tit. 23. Cap. 2. §. 6.

Cardinal *Cuſanus* [25] allowerh indeed Oecumenical Councils to be infallible: But to this End requireth ſo many conditions, that it is very difficult they ſhould all be had, and impoſſible to be known when had. The fourth condition is, *that the Council regulate it ſelf by the Rules of the Holy Ghoſt laid down in Scripture, and the definitions of precedent Councils. Otherwiſe that, howſoever free and univerſal, they may be appealed from, and proteſted againſt.* And at laſt concludes, that *it is to be ſeen by experience, that a full General Council can err; as diverſe ſuch Councils have been, which have erred in defining.* Thus he of Councils;

[25] *Notandum eſt experimento rerum Concilium univerſale plenarium poſſe deficere; quomodo etiam varia Concilia talia fecerunt, quæ judicando erràrunt.* Cuſan. Concord. Cath. lib. 2. cap. 3. & 4.

who

who hath much more about the errability of the Pope. Wherefore *Bellarmine* reckons him among the Parisians. *Nicholas de Clemangis* [26] expresly Disputes against the Infallibility of Councils. But because he preadmonisheth he affirms nothing, but only to dispute for finding out the truth: I shall not urge his Testimony.

[26] Clem. *in* Disp. *de* Conciliis.

Cardinal *Dominicus Jacobatius* [27] asserteth, that *when Popes and Councils disagree in defining; that judgment is to be preferred, which is consonant to the definitions of precedent Councils. If none of which have passed Sentence in this matter; then the Councils definition shall not be received, if the Popes be founded upon better reasons and authorities. For that a Council can erre;* as appears by that of Ariminum, *the Second of* Ephesus, *that of* Affick *under* Cyprian, *and many others. That the Infallibility of the Universal Church proves not the same to be in a Council: Since the Universal Church is not truly in a Council.* That in the case of contrary definitions by the Pope and a Council, *it is not yet defined, what is to be done or observed.* That *his Opinion however is, that he which should hold to and observe either part, should not therefore incur the danger of Damnation although he died in the observation of it.*

[27] *Quia Concilium potest errare, ut patet in Concilio* Ariminensi, Ephesino. 2. Africanâ *Synodo tempore* Cypriani, *& in aliis multis. Nec obstat si dicatur, quod Ecclesia non potest errare; quia intelligitur de Ecclesiâ universali. Sed Concilium repræsentativè dicitur Ecclesia; in Concilio enim verè non est universalis Ecclesia.* Jacob. *de* Concil. lib. 6. pag. 239.

All these manifestly teach that both a Pope, and Council, to whom alone active Infallibility is attributed may erre. Nor is it enough to say, that herein they deliver their judgments of the Pope and Council, disagreeing one from another, and not conjunctly defining. This indeed may seem to be said with some colour of Truth in *Jacobatius*: But as for *Occam* and *Alliacensis*, it doth by no means fit them. Nor yet doth it in the least enervate the Testimonies of the rest: Since whensoever they deny infallibility to Pope or Council; they do not thereto oppose the consent of both, but either the Symbolical and successive Church, as *Waldensis*; or the Universal, as all the rest. Besides they deny infallibility to belong to the representative Church, and to be the property of the Universal, whereas every one knoweth and acknowledgeth that only the representative Church is in a Council. As for *Jacobatius* his opinion it plainly is, that obedience is then immediately to be given to the

the Decree of a Pope or Council when it is consonant to the definition of some former, even particular Council, which had been received by the universal Church; that this obedience therefore is to be paid, not for the authority of the present definition, but the approbation of the Universal Church, which She is supposed to have given to it by a long reception. But what clears the matter beyond all exception, is that *Jacobatius* is one of those, who think the Church may fail, except one woman only: as we shall see afterwards under the third head.

The second *Classis* contains the testimonies of Doctors asserting the Church, for which Christ prayed, and promised the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it, not to be confined to the Ecclesiastick order, but may consist of believers of whatsoever rank and order. This *Petrus Alliacensis* expressly affirms in the place by us above cited. So the Author of the *Glosse* [28] upon the Canon Law, inquiring what Church it is that cannot err, determineth *it to be the Congregation of the faithful; which cannot fail, Christ having prayed for it:* and *Nicolas Lyra* [29] to those words, *The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*, affixeth this Glosse— *that is, to subvert it from the true faith.* To which he subjoyns. *Whence is manifest that the Church consists not in men in respect either of Ecclesiastical or Secular Dignity; (for they have sometimes apostatized from the Faith) but in those persons in whom remains a true knowledge and confession of the faith and truth.*

[28] *Quero de quâ Ecclesiâ intelligas quod hîc dicitur, quòd non possit errare? de ipso Papâ, qui Ecclesia dicitur? sed certum est, quòd Papa errare potest. Respondeo, ipsa congregatio fidelium hic dicitur Ecclesia. Et talis Ecclesia non potest non esse. Nam ipse Dominus orat pro Ecclesia.* Caus. 24. quæst. 1.

[29] *A verâ sc. fide subvertendo. Ex quo patet, quòd Ecclesia non consistit in hominibus ratione potestatis vel dignitatis Ecclesiastica vel secularis; quia multi principes, & summi Pontifices, &c. inventi sunt apostatâsse a fide. Propter quod Ecclesia consistit in illis personis; in quibus est notitia vera, & confessio fidei & veritatis.* Lyra *in* Matth. 16. 18.

The third *Classis* comprehendeth the testimonies of those who teach, that the whole Church may fail, except one only person, and that either Ecclesiastick or Laick, Man or Woman, and so the Church consist in that person alone. That the Church actually did so at the time of our Saviours Passion, *Tostatus* [30] (doth not assert, as *Suarez* [31] and *Bannes* [32] falsly relate, but) tells us it was the common opini-

[30] Tost. *in* Matth. praf quæst. 14.

[31] Suar. *de fide* disp. 9. Sect. 3.

[32] Bann. *in* 2. 2. q. 1. art. 10. dub.

on in his time. The ſame writes *Æneas Sylvius* in his *History of the Council of Baſil.* *Bannes* and *Turrecremata* [33] attribute this opinion to *Alexander Alenſis*, *Hugutius*, and *Durandus Mimatenſis*: the latter aſcribe it alſo to the whole multitude of Preachers; and produceth out of *Alenſis* [34] this ſentence. *That opinion, which ſaith the Church conſiſted in the Virgin alone, in whom alone remained true faith at the paſſion, ſeems true to us:* which *Turrecremata* alſo himſelf defends in many places, particularly *Summ. de Eccleſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 30. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 61. Beſide theſe four there are not, a few, of the ſame mind. *Ockam* [35] affirms that *the whole Faith of the Church may remain in one ſingle perſon, as it did in the bleſſed Virgin at the time of our Lords paſſion*; that *if God permitted this in the days of the Apoſtles, he will much ſooner permit it in theſe latter Ages*; and that *the contrary opinion is raſh.* *Panormitan* [36] in the words immediately following thoſe before cited, ſaith *it is poſſible the Faith of Chriſt may remain in one only perſon.* That *at the Paſſion of our Saviour it remained only in the bleſſed Virgin*; and that *for this cauſe probably the Gloſſe ſaith, whereſoever good men are, there is the Church of Rome.* This paſſage alſo, as well as the former, *Antonius Florentinus* tranſlated into his *Sum.* *Peter de Monte* [38] Biſhop of *Brixia* gives this reaſon, why Laicks ought to be admitted into the Council; *becauſe the Faith may poſſibly remain in one ſimple Laick, as it did formerly in the Bleſſed Virgin.* *Clemangis* [39] aſſerts *the Church may by grace remain in one ſingle woman, as formerly in the Virgin.* *Jacobatius* [40] writeth that *after the paſſion faith remained in the Bleſſed Virgin alone, that ſo the promiſe of indefectibility made by Chriſt unto his Church might not fail*; *which promiſe was made not to the repreſentive Church (or a Council)* but to the Univerſal. Laſtly *J. Fr. Picus Mirandula* [41] ſaith that *in the time of Chriſt*

[33] Torrec. *de* Eccleſ. lib. 3. cap. 6.

[34] *Opinio quæ dicit, quòd in ſolâ Virgine ſtetit Eccleſia, in quâ ſola fides manſit in paſſione, videtur nobis vera.*

[35] *In uno ſolo poteſt ſtare tota fides Eccleſiæ; quemadmodum tempore mortis Chriſti tota fides Eccleſiæ in B. Virgine remanebat. Non eſt etiam credendum, &c.* Occ. Dial. part 1. lib. 2. cap. 25.

[36] *Poſſibile eſt, quòd vera fides Chriſti remaneret in uno ſolo— Hoc patuit poſt paſſionem Chriſti. Nam, &c. Et fortè hinc dicit Gloſſa, quòd ubi ſunt boni, ibi eſt Eccleſia Romana.* Panorm. loc. cit.

[38] *Quia fides poteſt remanere etiam apud ſimplicem Laicum, & in aliis omnibus ferire, ſicut accidit in perſonâ B. Mariæ in paſſione Chriſti.* Pet. *de Monte* lib. *de Monarchiâ*

[39] *In ſolâ poteſt mulierculâ per gratiam manere Eccleſia; ſicut &c.* Clem. diſp. de Concil.

[40] *Nam & remanſit fides in B. Virgine aliis deficientibus poſt paſſionem, ut oſtenderetur quod non poſſit deſinere fides, pro quâ Chriſtus oravit, cùm dixit Petro. Et ego pro te rogavi, ut, non deficiat fides tua. Et non intelligitur, &c.* Jac. de Concil. lib. 6. p. 242.

[41] *Chriſti tempore deficientibus in fide Apoſtolis integra & omnino perfectiſſima fides in ſola Virgine Domini matre remanſit.* Pic. Theor. 13.

Christ the Apostles falling away from the Faith, it remained intire and perfect in the Virgin alone.

The fourth Classis exhibits only *Jandovesius* of *Minorca*, who by the relation of *Baunes* [40] taught about the year 1363. that in the time of Antichrist the Church should consist only of baptized infants, all adult persons apostatizing from the Faith.

[40] Bann. Comm. fus. *in* 2. 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. dub. 1.

Thus far these testimonies, which occurred to me in a hasty search. If I had time or opportunity to turn over the Writings of the XIII. XIV. and XV. Ages; I doubt not but I should find many more. However any one may see, how utterly repugnant these which I have produced are to the Infallibility of Pope and Council. Yet there is no sentence pronounced against these Writers, no mark set upon them, not the least censure inflicted on them. How can this be, if they had taught right down heresie? Nay this opinion is not only not condemned, but also many ways approved. First, in that the Defenders of it have been preferred to the greatest dignities of the Church; some made Cardinals, others Presidents of Councils, one (*Antoninus Florentinus*) Sainted and at this day Worshipped. Which surely would not have been done, if he had taught Heresie. But what is more express, and which cannot be eluded, is that *Thomas Waldensis*'s work, whence he produced the clearest passages, was solemnly approved by Pope *Martin* V. This *Trithemius* [42] affirms telling us that *Martin V. examined this work, and confirmed it by Apostolical authority.* The Bull of approbation also may be seen prefixed before the third Volume; with the Examination subjoyned, which lasted above a month; when the work being presented to the Pope, it was by him confirmed in full Consistory. So that after this strict examination and solemn approbation to imagine heresie is contained in this Book, will draw the Pope, who approved it, and the whole Church (which never opposed this approbation) into the suspicion of heresie.

[42] *Quod* Martinus *Papa* V. *examinatum authoritate Apostolicâ confirmavit.* Trithem *in* Vald.

I have done with the first argument. The second shall be drawn from the silence of the Council of *Trent*; which alone proveth that they thought it not an Article of Faith; since they condemned not the Protestants on that account, although no less vigorously impugning it, than any other Article of their Church. This argument is so much the stronger, in that our

Adversaries frequently urge the silence of the Council of *Trent* to prove Articles, by us objected to them, not to be of Faith. So *Veronus*, and the *Valemburgian* Brethren in the book abovementioned. So the Bishop of *Meaux* in that Famous Book, which hath illuded so many. If they reasoned well herein; why may not we use the same Arguments? And then the Infallibility of the Church cannot be of Faith, because wholly pretermitted by the *Tridentine* Council.

Lastly, that it is not of Faith may be proved hence, that no foundation of such a Faith can be alledged. For if any were, it must be either Scripture, or Tradition, or some decree of the Ruling Church, or the consent of the Universal Church. That Scripture and Tradition cannot be produced in this Case, we have already demonstrated, for this reason especially, because the certainty of both depends upon the testimony of the Church. Yet *Amicus* [43] flieth thither; who after he had objected our argument to himself, answers that *Scripture and Tradition may be taken either as approved by the infallible judgment of the living Rule, and so of divine authority, and to be believed by infused Faith. That thus considered they cannot be produced to prove the authority of the living Rule*: Or *they may be taken as only testified and confirmed by humane reason, and so of humane authority, and to be believed by acquired Faith*: That *this way considered they are produced to prove the living Rule*: *wanting indeed infallible divine authority, but having such humane authority, as by the accession of Christs Providence over his Church becomes infallible.*

[43] *Sumi possunt Traditio & Scriptura primo modo ut approbata infallibili judicio ipsius regulæ animatæ, quo pacto sunt authoritatis divinæ & credendæ fide infusâ. Hoc autem modo a nobis non sumuntur ad probandam infallibilem authoritatem regulæ animatæ. Secundo modo sumi possunt, ut testata signis & rationibus humanis, ut quod, &c. quo pacto sunt authoritatis humanæ & credendæ fide acquisitâ, Atque hoc modo sumuntur, ad probandam, &c.* Amic. *de Fide* disp. 6. n. 52.

I wish the Jesuit in writing this had first objected to himself our whole Argument. For that is drawn not only from the impossibility of knowing, according to our Adversaries, the Divinity of Scripture or Tradition without being first assured of the infallibility of the Church; but also from hence, that they teach it cannot be known which are the Canonical books, whether received by us uncorrupted, or faithfully Translated, and is the true sense of them, without the same previous assurance. If he had objected all this to himself; he must either have departed from all the rest of their Divines, and denied their so much boasted of arguments, or have yeilded herein. Yet let

us examine what he offers. First therefore his joyning the providence of Christ to the yet human authority of Scripture and Tradition is frivolous and absurd. For of that we are assured no otherwise than by Faith, and consequently it cannot be a foundation to Faith. Now this being taken away, the other Arguments of the Truth of Scripture and Tradition according to the Jesuits argumentation become fallible, and so no fit foundation for infallible Faith. Besides I would know whether this acquired Faith carrieth with it indubitable Truth, and be of the same certainty with Divine or infused faith, or at least sufficient to found Divine Faith upon. For if it be not, our argument returns: If it be, why may we not have without the assistance of the Churches authority a Divine Faith of those things, which Scripture, or if you will, Tradition also, clearly and plainly teach, at least as clearly, as they are thought to teach that infallibility of the Church.

But *Amicus* hath a reserve for this. He pretends [43] that although the human Arguments of the Truth of Scripture and Tradition be self evident avd sufficient to create a Divine Faith; yet that we are forbidden by God to believe them with a Divine Faith, till his Vicar the Pope shall have confirmed them. A miserable refuge, which lyeth open to a thousand inconveniencies. For to omit asking where this prohibition of God is to be found; not to urge that hereby all their Arguments drawn from the nature of the thing concerning the uncerainty of any revealed Article without the supervenient Authority of the Church, are wholly destroyed; not to say, that hereby the controversie is turned from matter of Right into matter of Fact, and become a meer enquiry, whether God hath made any such prohibition: Laying aside I say all these things, I will insist upon this one Observation. It is not here enquired, whether Scripture and Tradition proposed by any other than the Pope oblige us to assent or not; but only whether any one, either obliged or not obliged, can receive them howsoever proposed and thence build his Faith upon them. If he can, then our Argument returns; and we may also believe with Divine Faith what we find taught in Scripture. If he cannot, I would fain know which way then Papists can admit Scripture and Tradition, and from them learn the Infallibity of the Church; since *Amicus* had before denied that it could be Learned, or ought to be

[43] Ibid. num. 49.

be believed for the teſtimony of Scripture and Tradition, as infallibly propoſed by the Church.

It is manifeſt therefore, the belief of the Infallibility of the Church cannot reſt on Scripture or Tradition. But neither can it on the judgment of the Ruling Church. For beſides that no ſuch judgment is produced; if it were, it would be fruitleſs. For then, what was never granted, the Church will be judge and give ſentence in her own cauſe: which *Alphonſus a Caſtro* [45] denieth to Scripture; *becauſe that were to run in* infinitum, *and no teſtimony can be valid in its own cauſe.* For imagine any one, that believed not the Church to be infallible now to begin to believe it: This firſt act of belief cannot be founded upon the judgment of the Church. For whoſoever believeth any thing for the ſake of the Churches judgment, did before believe that judgment to be certain; which deſtroyeth the ſuppoſition.

[45] *Si de Scripturâ ipſâ eſt quæſtio, non poterit ipſamet eſſe Judex: quia tunc erit abire in infinitum. In propriâ cauſâ nullius teſtimonium eſt validum.* Caſtr. de juſtâ hæret. punit. lib. 1. cap. 5.

This our Adverſaries confeſs. So *Conink* [46]. *The judgment, whereby we judge that we are to believe the Church hath infallible authority of propoſing matters of Faith, ought to be grounded upon other arguments or ſome other foundations* So alſo Mœratius [47]. *None can believe this Article of our Faith* (the Infallibility of the Church) *the Churches authority it ſelf intervening to this aſſent, as the rule infallibly propoſing matters of belief.*

[46] *Judicium quo judicamus nobis credendum eſſe Eccleſiam habere infallibilem omnino authoritatem proponendi res fidei, debet aliis notis, ſive alio fundamento niti.* Conink. de actib. ſup. diſp. 17. dub. 3.

[47] *Nemo poteſt credere hunc Articulum fidei noſtræ, interveniente ad aſſenſum hunc ipſâ Eccleſiæ authoritate, tanquam regulâ res credendas infallibiliter proponente.* Mærat. de fide diſp. 17. Sect. 2.

There remains therefore only the belief of the Univerſal Church, wherein this Faith of private Papiſts herein can relie. Many things might here be ſaid: but becauſe we ſhall handle that matter more fully at the end of this Treatiſe; we will not anticipate our arguments here. I ſhall only in a word obſerve the abſurdity of it. Our Adverſaries ſay, that private perſons ought to believe the active infallibility of the Ruling Church; becauſe they ſee it believed by the Univerſal Church. But why doth the Univerſal Church believe it: truly for no other reaſon, but becauſe She do believe it. For the Univerſal Church is nothing elſe, but the collection of all ſingle believers.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

That it is uncertain, what are thoſe Decrees of the Church, whereon Faith may relie.

WHAT I ſaid will be more manifeſt to him, who ſhall conſider; that to make the Decrees of the Church a fit foundation for our Faith, it is not ſufficient to know that the Church in defining cannot err; unleſs alſo we know, what are thoſe definitions of the Church, which are placed beyond all danger of errour. For our Adverſaries all acknowledge, that the Church doth not always, nor in all things enjoy this priviledge of Infallibility; but in many things may be miſtaken, as in defining Philoſophical queſtions: and in general whatſoever belongeth not to Religion. Some add Controverſies of Fact; others Canonization of Saints; many all thoſe things, which although belonging to Faith, are not yet propoſed as of Faith, but only ſimply affirmed, or brought for the illuſtrating and confirming of ſome other matter. Since the Church therefore may be miſtaken in ſo many things: we ought to be well acquainted, what thoſe Decrees are, wherein She cannot err.

That this notwithſtanding is moſt uncertain, two things evince. Firſt that it appears not, what are the conditions, what the Character and Notes of a firm and valid Decree. Secondly, that although this ſhould appear, it would not yet be known what are thoſe particular Decrees, which have theſe Characters. The firſt again is manifeſt by two reaſons: firſt in that it is uncertain whether theſe exceptions, wherewith the infallibility of the Church is limited, be all lawful; and then no leſs uncertain whether they be all, which can and ought to be aſſigned. For if both theſe things be not certainly known; we ſhall continually doubt, whether we do not for ſome unjuſt exception undeſervedly reject ſome Decree of the Church, that ought to be obeyed; and received ſome other, which for ſome juſt exception not yet aſſigned ought to be rejected.

But both on the contrary are uncertain. The firſt, concerning

cerning the lawfulneſs of the conditions already aſſigned is, becauſe our Adverſaries themſelves do ſo irreconciliably differ in aſſigning them. Whatſoever one layeth down, ſome other removeth: So that nothing certain can be had thence. Nor can it be ſaid theſe conditions are ſelf evident, or of Faith. For what evidence is that which eſcapes the knowledge of ſo many Learned men? And our Adverſaries grant, as we ſaw before, that nothing can be of Faith, whereof Catholick Divines diſpute unregarded by the Church. Beſides if it be of Faith, it muſt be revealed. But where is this revelation? In Scripture? Nothing either is or can be produced thence. In Tradition? That will afford perhaps two or three Teſtimonies of the Antients, but which reſpect only one condition (that of excluding Controverſies of Fact) and are themſelves liable to many exceptions. But granting they are not, what ſhall become of the other conditions aſſigned, of no leſs moment: Or what will two or three Teſtimonies avail, wherein their Authors affirm not what they write to be of Faith: Nor will the Regent Church give us any help herein. For She hath defined nothing in this matter; or if ſhe had, it would be wholly vain. For it would ſtill be enquired, whether that Definition were of Faith; and ſo in *infinitum*. As for the Univerſal Church, She can have no place here, as well for the reaſons abovementioned, as becauſe her diſſent rather than conſent is to he ſhewed herein.

There is no way therefore left, but to recur to Experience. They will ſay they have obſerved the Church to erre, when ſhe undertook to define in caſes excluded by their exceptions; and that theſe exceptions therefore muſt neceſſarily be applied to thoſe places of Scripture, which attribute infallibility to the Church. But then they will give us juſt reaſon to reply, that if experience giveth us a right to reject that ſenſe of Scripture, which the words ſeem to imply, meerly becauſe it is repugnant to our Obſervations, and ſubſtitute another more congruous to them? Then we may moſt juſtly reject that ſenſe of thoſe Words, *This is my Body*, which our Adverſaries affix to them, as contrary to the experience of all mankind, and aſſign another perfectly accommodated both to reaſon and experience. Beſides there is nothing againſt which our Adverſaries more ſharply contend, than to judge and examine the Definitions of the Church by dumb and dead Rules, ſuch as Scripture and Tradition

Tradition are: yet this very thing is done by those men, who thence conclude the Church to be fallible in certain cases, because they have observed her to have been formerly mistaken in them. For this can be done no otherwise than by examining the Decrees of the Church, either by Scripture, or Tradition.

Again, if experience giveth them a right to limit the infallibility of the Church by their exceptions; why may not we challenge the same priviledge, and assign our exceptions likewise. We then lay down only that one, formerly proposed by *Cusanus*, which if admitted by our Adversaries, will soon put an end to all controversies, that is, that the Church never presume to define any thing but according to the Holy Scriptures, leaving undecided all things, wherein they are either silent or obscure. And so all our Controversies are reduced to this one point, whether this exception is to be added to those which our Adversaries have assigned. As often therefore as they oppose to us the judgment of the Church, we may with reason reject it, till they can shew, that our exception is unjust, which they will never be able to do. On the contrary we can demonstrance the equity of it by experience, and shew that the Church hath erred, as often as She observed not this exception. But let it be rejected. Who can tell, Whether no other is to be added? Certainly if the observation of the past Errours of the Church have given occasion to these Writers to form these exceptions; the observation of future errors will likewise produce new exceptions. Nay who will warrant, that nothing already past hath escaped the notice of these Observers, whence other exceptions might have been framed?

And hence also appears what I undertook to prove in the second place, that although we were assured the exceptions are lawful and justly assigned; we cannot be certain they are all that are so, and whether others are not yet to be added. For since the exceptions are formed only from experience; if the Authors of them made not a just observation of all the past errours of the Church, or had not in their eye all possible future errors of a different nature; there may be other exceptions, no less necessary and momentous, to be assigned. And how shall we be at last ascertained of the requisite diligence, sagacity, and prudence of these Observers? I shall illustrate all by a famous example. One of the cheif exceptions, whereby the Papal power is limited, is that all those Decrees are excluded, which

were not for ſome ſpace of time affixed to the doors of St. *Peters* Church and the Apoſtolick Chancery, and ſolemnly promulged by the Popes Meſſengers in the wonted places. This exception was made about an hundred years ſince meerly to ſerve a turn; when they could by no other means elude the arguments of the Proteſtants againſt the Papal Infallibility drawn from Pope *Clement* VIII. his Bull, whereby he re-called *Sixtus* V. his Edition of the Bible, and Preface prefixed to it. Then it was they forged this exception pretending that *Sixtus* his Bull, although printed and prefixed to his Bibles, had not been ſolemnly publiſhed by the Meſſengers. An exception, which had been never dreamt of, had not *Sixtus* erred; as appeareth hence, that the precedent Writers *Cajetan*, *Canus*, and *Bellarmine* make no mention of it, whereas of the ſubſequent Writers few forget it. Nor is there any doubt, but that if any Pope hereafter ſhould commit ſome other miſtake, which might wound his pretended Infallibility; ſome other Exception would be framed to ſalve his honour.

If therefore our Adverſaries, as we have proved, cannot certainly know what are the conditions and characters of the Infallible Decrees of the Church, they muſt neceſſarily be ignorant, which Decrees may be ſecurely believed and obeyed. But granting they might be certain herein, and taking away all theſe ſcruples, they will be yet for ever uncertain which Decrees have, which want theſe conditions. For what will it avail to know that the Church, may err in matters Philoſophical, or of Fact, or which are not propoſed as of Faith; if we be uncertain what are Philoſophical matters, what of Fact, and what propoſed as of Faith? Yet that all theſe kinds of things are yet uncertain, will be eaſily evinced. For,

Firſt, ſince the School Divines have ſo intermingled *Ariſtotles* Philoſophy with Divinity, nothing is more difficult than exactly to diſtinguiſh them. Whence it frequently happens, that what one accounts meerly Philoſophical, another eſteems matter of Divinity. So in the year 1666. when a certain Theatine [1] at *Paris* had propoſed theſe and ſuch like *Theſes* to be publickly diſputed of, *viz.* That *any knowledge in the Father was abſolutely ſufficient to beget the Son; ſo that if the Father had underſtood but any one object, ſuppoſe a Lilly, he muſt be thereby ſuppoſed to have begotten the Son, that if both together had loved but any one object*

[1] *Apud* Launoi Epiſt. part 5. Epiſt. 2. *ad* Errruer.

ject, as a Rose, yet would they thereby have spirated the Holy Ghost. That the unspeakable torment of Devils consists in this, that by hypostatical union the Devil is become fire, and fire become the Devil. These and the like Theses the proposer maintained to be Theological. *Launoy* contends they are Philosophical; others think, perhaps more truly, that they are foolish and prophane. The Council of *Constance* defined the accidents in the Eucharist to remain destitute of any subject. The *Cartesians* deny this, and value not the definition, pretending that it is about a matter Philosophical. Others thereupon accuse their denial of heresie. *Copernicus* and *Galilæus* their Systeme of the world were condemned at *Rome*. Some thereupon dare not embrace it, though otherwise inclined to believe it. Others more bold contend it is purely a matter of Philosophy. See therefore many learned and wise men divided about the application of the first exception. And if so, how shall more ignorant persons be able rightly to distinguish them, and thence certainly to know, to which of the Churches Decrees they are to give a steadfast, and to which a dubious Faith?

The same is the case of the second Exception. Many of our Adversaries deny the Church to be infallible in questions of Fact. In the mean while they differ about determining, what are matters of Fact, and what of right. To know what is the sense of a late Writer, many account a question of Fact. *Estrix* [2] on the contrary contends it belong to right.

[2] Estr. Diat. *de sapientiâ* &c. assert.

The same may be said of the third Exception. That excludes from the rank of infallible all Decrees not proposed as of Faith. But what those Decrees are, doth not appear. So the Council of *Trent*, for example, defined that the body of Christ exists under the Bread *by vertue of the words*, but the Blood *not by vertue of the words, but by concomitance*. No anathema being inflicted upon those, that think otherwise. Hence arose a question, whether this distinction were of Faith. Some in *Vasquez* [3] hold the negative: himself largely endeavours to prove the affirmative. This might be further confirmed with innumerabe instances. But I chuse rather to take notice of somewhat more remarkable. The Church in defining hath in these latter Ages been wont to make use of words, which might rather conceal than declare her opinion, and from which the most sagacious persons should not collect her meaning. For example one of the notes, whereby we know,

[3] Vasq. *in* 3. disp. 185. cap. 2.

whether a definition be by the Church propoſed as of Faith, is the excommunication of the Deniers of it, yet it ſometimes happens the Church would not have that be thought to be of Faith, the Deniers whereof She excommunicates. So the Council of *Trent* [6] having enjoyned that every one conſcious of any mortal ſin, ſhould confeſs, before he communicates; ſubjoyneth: *If any one preſume to teach, preach, or pertinaciouſly aſſert the contrary; let him be* ipſo facto *excommunicate.* Any one would hereby imagine, that the opinion of *Cajetan* were condemned of Hereſie. Yet *Canus* [7] tells us, that *for caution ſake it was not; and of this,* ſaith he, *we, that were preſent in the Council are Witneſſes.* See another Artifice, which creates more perplexities. When the Church condemneth many propoſitions in one Decree; it oftimes happens, that they are not all of the ſame kind and quality; but ſome *Heretical,* others only *erroneus,* ſome *Raſh,* others *Scandalous,* and ſome *Offenſive to Pious Ears,* as they are wont to term them. Now none but Heretical propoſitions hurt the Faith, and conſequently if the Church be infallible only in matters, which ſhe propoſeth as of Faith, when ſhe condemneth theſe mixed propoſitions, her judgment is infallible only in reſpect of the Heretical ones. The reſt may with ſafety and truth be defended. It is of infinite concern therefore in the direction of our Faith; that theſe propoſitions ſhould be diſtributed into their ſeveral Claſſes, and the particular cenſure ſpecified in each of them. But that is very rarely done. The propoſitions are all huddled up together: And we are only told in general, that ſome of them are Heretical, others Erroneus, *&c.*

[6] *Si quis contrarium docere, prædicare, vel pertinaciter aſſerere præſumpſerit, eo ipſo excommunicatus exiſtat.*

[7] *Hoc propter periculum cautum eſt — Nam quod ſententia Cajetani non fuerit pro hereticâ condemnata & nos teſtes ſumus, qui Concilio interfuimus.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 5.

Thus the Council of *Conſtance* [8] condemned 45 Propoſitions of *Wickliff* in theſe Words. *This Holy Synod hath cauſed them to be examined, and 'tis found, that many of them are notoriouſly Heretical, others not Catholick but erroneous, ſome ſcandalous and blaſphemous, ſome offenſive to pious ears, and ſome raſh and ſeditious.* In the ſame manner that Council condemned Thirty Aſſertions of *John Huſſe*; without acquainting us what particularly in them is contrary to Faith, and conſequently what wherein themſelves cannot err. The Popes make uſe of the ſame trick. So the Bull [9] wherewith *Pius* V. and *Gregory*

[8] *Quibus examinatis fuit repertum aliquos & plures ex ipſis fuiſſe & eſſe notorie hæreticos, alios non Catholicos ſed erroneos, alios ſcandaloſos & Blaſphemos quoſdam piarum aurium offenſivos, nonnullos eorum temerarios & ſeditioſos.* Concil. Conſt. Seſſ. 8.

[9] *Quas quidem ſententias, quanquam nonnulle aliquo pacto ſuſtineri poſſent, in rigore tamen hæreticas, erroneas, &c. reſpective damnamus.* Bulla *ad calcem Opeum.* Vaſq.

Gregory XIII. condemned Seventy five Propoſitions of *Michael Baius* after it hath recited them, and confeſſed that *divers of them might be in ſome ſenſe maintained, condemns them all reſpectively, as Heretical, erroneous, ſuſpected, raſh, ſcandalous, and offenſive to pious ears.* See an ambiguous ſentence, and very unfit to remove ſcruples. Nor doth *Vaſquez* deny it, but tells [5] us, that *from their cenſure doth not appear, what cenſure agreeth to each ſingle Propoſition.* Wherefore when himſelf had undertaken to defend ſome of theſe Propoſitions; that he might know in which of them the Poyſon of Hereſie lay hid; he began to read *Baius*'s Book, having firſt asked leave. But when that would not do, he conſulted Cardinal *Toletus*, whom the Pope had ſent to *Lovain*, to ſee the Bull put in execution; and Learned from him that the Popes had condemned ſome of thoſe Propoſitions, only becauſe they were too ſharply worded. Now what a rare help doth the Church afford in declaring to every one what he ſhould believe when the ſenſe of her own decrees cannot be known without conſulting her moſt intimate Counſellours, ſuch as *Canus* and *Toletus*?

[5] *Ex quâ cenſurâ non apparet, qualis unicuique propoſitioni cenſura ſigillatim conveniat.* Vaſq. *in* 1. 2. Diſp. 190. cap. 18.

Further it may very well be, that he which knoweth the particular propoſitions condemned of Hereſie, may be ignorant wherein the Hereſie conſiſts. For the ſame propoſition may admit of many ſenſes, whereof ſome may be true, others falſe, ſome Heretical, others not. If the Church had any care of the truth: She ought accurately to diſtinguiſh theſe ſences, and tell us which may be admitted, and which ought to be exploded. But nothing of this is done. Rather *Pius* V. and *Gregory* XIII. declaring that ſome of *Baius* his Propoſitions are in ſome ſenſe maintainable but in rigour heretical, tell us neither what is that harmleſs ſenſe, which may be defended, nor that pernicious Hereſie, which ought to be avoided.

But nothing evinceth this more clearly, than what lately happened upon occaſion of the Janſeniſt Doctrine. Five Propoſitions were taken out of *Janſenius* his *Auguſtinus*, and by ſome French Biſhops ſent to be examined by the Pope. Others were preſent for *Janſenius*, who pleaded the Propoſitions were capable of divers ſenſes, ſome true, ſome falſe; and earneſtly deſired it might be ſpecified in which ſenſe each Propoſition were approved or condemned. That requeſt being ſtifly denied by the Roman Conſiſtory, who were reſolved to condemn them in

in the groſs: The Janſeniſts diſtinguiſhed Three Senſes of each Propoſition, and placing the different ſenſes in Three Columns offered them to the Examiners, deſiring they would admoniſh which of all thoſe ſenſes the Cenſure aimed at. But neither ſo could they obtain their End. Only afterwards when the Controverſie grew hot, Pope *Alexander* VII. declared the Propoſitions were condemned in the ſenſe intended by the Author. The Author had been now dead, before his Book was publiſhed, much leſs condemned. And ſo while the Popes pretended to condemn the Authors ſenſe; they ſaid nothing elſe but that they condemned a ſenſe; which neither they would, nor any body elſe could tell, what it was. And to this day it is diſputed among them, what is that Heretical ſenſe intended by the Author and condemned by the Popes.

Thus much of the Third Exception. I might add another, which not a few of our Adverſaries produce. For they require, that the Church proceed maturely, diligently, and Canonically in her judgment: Which certainly few or none can know. But becauſe the conſideration of this would take up too much time. I ſhall omit it: Having already ſufficiently evinced, that nothing is more uncertain, than to know what are thoſe Decrees of the Church, which may be ſecurely believed; and conſequently that Faith cannot be founded on them.

CHAP. VI.

That it is uncertain, what is that part of the Univerſal Church, to which active Infallibility belongs.

And Firſt, that it doth not appear, whether it be in the Pope.

IF we ſhould after all this grant the knowledg of the Churches Infallibility, and of her Infallible Decrees, not to be impoſſible, this would contribute nothing to the eſtabliſhing our Faith; unleſs it were likewiſe known, what is that Supream Tribunal, whoſe Decrees are to be obey'd. *For if this were uncertain,* ſaith Arriaga, [1] *whatſoever is believed as of Faith concerning a Judge of Controverſies in the Church, would be ridiculous.* Now this

[1] *Si enim incertum hoc eſſet; quicquid de judice controverſiarum in Eccleſiâ ut certum de fide creditur, eſſet planè ridiculum* Arr. *de Fide* Diſp. 7. Sect. 8.

this thing is really uncertain, as I ſhall prove. There are three opinions concerning it among our Adverſaries. For this Supream and Infallible power is by moſt aſſigned to the Pope alone, by almoſt all the French and ſome few more to a Council alone, and laſtly to Pope and Council together by ſome very few, ſo few, that I could never find one that expreſly aſſerted this opinion, and but two or three that obſcurely inſinuate it.

I begin with the Pope; and affirm, that unleſs his Infallibility be of Faith, his Decrees cannot be the foundation of Faith. No other certainty will here ſuffice, for as for Moral and Self evident, here is not the leaſt ſhadow of them; and that of Theological Concluſions I before excluded. So that certainty of Faith is neceſſary. This our Adverſaries confeſs, at leaſt thoſe of the firſt opinion. *Caſpenſis* [2] writeth that *unleſs we believe by Divine Faith ſuch Popes to be the Succeſſors of* Peter, *there is nothing we can believe with Divine Faith.* Martinonus [3] that *the Pope could not oblige us to believe as of Faith what he defineth to be revealed by God, unleſs it were of Faith, that he hath the power of defining, and infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* Rhodius [4] *that unleſs the infallibility of the Pope were of Faith; it would not be of Faith; that he is not actually miſtaken.*

[2] *Niſi fide divinâ credamus ejuſmodi Pontifices eſſe ſucceſſores Petri, nihil eſt quod poſſumus fide divina credere.* Caſp. *de fide* diſp. 2. Sect. 6.

[3] *Pontifex non poſſet nos obligare ad credendum de fide id quod definit ut dictum a Deo; niſi de fide eſſet ipſum habere poteſtatem definiendi & infalibilem aſſiſtentiam* Sp. S. Mart. *de fide* diſp. 9. Sect. 6.

[4] *Si non eſſet de fide, quòd (Papa) ſit infallibilis; ergo non eſt de fide quòd non fallatur.* Rhod. *de fide* quæſt. 3. Sect. 1. §. 3.

Is it therefore of Faith that the Pope is infallible? So indeed ſome of them maintain, as *Suarez, Caſtrus, Palaus, Lud. Abelly, Ja. Vernautius, Fr. Macedo, Theoph. Raynaudus, Amicus Caſpenſis, Martinonus, Rhodius*, and others. Yea *Abelly* [5] affirms that *it is a fundamental truth of Religion, a Prime Article of Faith, upon which the reſt depend*, and the contrary opinion *a capital hereſie. Vernautius* [6] concludeth that *none without the crime of hereſie can hold an opinion contrary to the belief of the Pope propoſed to all the faithful. Macedo* [7] thinks *the denial of it to be an undoubted error in Faith, and if obſtinately perſiſted in hereſie.* Laſtly *Raynaudus* [8] tells us, *the deniers are by many, if not by all beyond the Alpes and Pyrenæans accounted hereticks, at leaſt materially.* When he ſaith *materially*, he meaneth

[5] *Veritatem religionis fundamentalem, articulum fidei ex præcipuis unum, cui innitantur cæteri omnes.* Abelly *apud* Eſtrix Diat. aff. 47. [6] *Neminem poſſe ſine crimine hereſeos doctrinam tenere contrariam Pontificis fidei omnibus fidelibus propoſitæ.* Vern. *apud eundem.* [7] *Cenſeo qui abſolutè negat infallibilem eſſe Papam — errare haud dubiè in fide, & ſi in errore obſtinatus perſeveret; hæreticum fore.* Mac. *ibidem.* [8] *Qui Pontifici eam infallibilitatem abrogant, a pleriſque, ſi minus ab omnibus trans Alpes & Pyrenæos habentur hæretici ſaltem materialiter.* Rayn. *de vera ipſa* punct. 5.

eth

neth in the Language of the Schoolmen that the opinion of these Deniers is accounted in it self heretical, and wants only obstinacy in the defenders to make it downright and *formal* Heresie. Now this obstinacy is judged of, partly by the external Proposition of the Truth opposed to Heresie, partly by the internal disposition of mind. Now because the latter is known to God alone, and all truths are not sufficiently proposed to all; therefore those of whom *Raynaudus* speaks do wisely in laying down that limitation of *material Heresie*. But this *Salvo* will not serve the Learned disbelievers of the Papal infallibility. For since it is as clearly revealed to them, as it is to the believers of it: Either those are rank Hereticks, whom a sufficient Proposition will not convince; or these fools, who assent to an opinion insufficiently proposed.

Thus indeed these Writers: But others are of a contrary opinion, as *Bellarmine, Vasquez, Tannerus, Duval*, the *Valemburgii*, *Gab. Boyvin*, and others, who strenuously maintain the Infallibility of the Pope, and yet deny it to be of Faith. *Duval* [9] produceth three weighty reasons.

[9] Duval. *de potest.* Pont. part. 2. quæst. 1.

1. *For that it hath been no where defined.* 2. *That the opposite Doctors, as* Alliacensis, Gerson, *&c. Were never condemned.* 3. *In that the Scripture doth not clearly enough teach this Infallibility.* The two first reasons are also made use of by *Bellarmine, Vasquez*, the *Valemburgii*, and *Boyvin*. And indeed this opinion is most consonant to the received Principles of their Church. For if nothing can be an Article of Faith, of which their Divines freely dispute unregarded by the Church: This certainly cannot be; whose Truth hath been and is to this day fiercely disputed of among them, even by *Bellarmines* Confession from the time of the Council of *Constance*; the Church all this while inflicting no censure on either party. Besides if the Infallibility of the Pope be of Faith; it will then be Heresie to deny it, as we saw some before asserting. *Hadrianus Florentius* therefore was an Heretick, (who affirms [11] *the Pope can err even in those things which concern Faith by asserting Heresie by his determination or decretal, and that many Popes have been Hereticks.*) and the Church will be a favourer of Heresie in that She afterwards promoted *Hadrian* to the Popedom without first requiring of him an abjuration of his Heresie.

[11] *Certum est, quod possit (Pontifex) errare etiam in iis quæ tangunt fidem, Heresin per suam determinationem vel Decretalem asserendo plures enim fuerunt Pontifices* Rom. *hæretici.* Hadr. *in* Dictat. *in* 4. Sentent.

Again if this opinion be Heretical, the Council of *Basil* will be

be heretical, that defined it and vigorously maintained it: The *Sorbon* and *Gallican* Clergy hereticks, that teach it: the Pope a favourer of heresie, who daily conferreth Abbies, Bishopricks, and Cardinals Hats on notorious Hereticks, giveth them places in Councils, and maintains Communion with them: the whole Latin Church will have been divided in point of Faith, and part infected with heresie, part with the Communion of hereticks, for many Ages, from the Council of *Constance* according to *Bellarmine*, but even from the time of *Firmilian* (or the middle of the third Century) according to *Lupus*; who assigns *Firmilian* to be the first opposer of Papal Infallibility, and makes St. *Basil* to have been his Successor in opinion, as well as in the See of *Cæsarea*, that thenceforward this Heresie got ground among the *Grecians*, insomuch as the *Pelagians* condemned by the Popes, appealed to the Council at *Ephesus*, hoping their sentence might easily be reversed by the Greek Bishops, as not allowing the Popes Infallibility. If so, then this dissention is very ancient in the Church; which if it toucheth Faith, then a pestilent Heresie hath for many Ages been connived at by the Church and Councils. But whatsoever becomes of *Lupus* his Calculation, certain it is this dissention hath continued from the Council of *Constance*, so that if it be concerning a matter of Faith, the Church of *Rome* hath all this while wanted that glorious Character of Unity of Faith, which She so much boasts of.

CHAP. VII.

That it is not certain, whether the Pope in defining used all diligence necessary to a right definition, or whether he observed all the wonted solemnities in publishing his Decree.

ANother scruple next ariseth, no less weighty than the former. For granting we may be assured of the Infallibility of the Pope, it is still to be inquired which be those Decrees of his that are infallibly true. For that all are not so our Adversaries confess. Many things are by them required, and besides those before mentioned two other conditions, *viz.* Diligence of the Pope in well examining the question to be defined, and observation of the due solemnities in publishing the definition. For the first, they

require that he diligently consult Scripture and Tradition, address himself by Prayers to God, and omit nothing, which may assist him in finding out the Truth. So *Tapperus*[1], *Canus*[2], *Cellotius*[3], *Bagotius*[4], and many others, but above all *Duvall*[5], who not only proposeth, but also accurately demonstrates the necessity of these conditions.

[1] Tapp. orat. 3.
[2] Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 5.
[3] Cell. *de* Hier. lib. 4. cap. 10.
[4] Bag. Instit. Theol.
[5] Duval. *de* Pot. Pont. Sect. 2. quæst. 5.

But who can assure us, that this requisite diligence was always used? Or as often as a Papal decree comes forth, are we to suspend our assent, till we be ascertained that nothing requisite was omitted by the Pope? If that be true, there will be few Decrees, to which we owe assent and obedience. *Canus, Bellarmine, Suarez, Duvall, Martinennus, Rhodius,* and many others answer, that as he which promiseth the End, promiseth also the the means of that End; so Christ in promising Infallibility to the Pope must be supposed likewise to have promised that he would take care the Pope should never omit any thing necessary for finding out of truth and declaring it to others when found. I will not now enquire, whether this be consonant to what they teach about the Controversie of *the Aids of Grace*. I only ask, whether what they alledge be certain. If not, our Faith will always fluctuate, and ever be uncertain. That it is not certain *Tapperus* [6] ingenuously confesseth. *Whether,* saith he, *if it should happen, that the Pope proceeds wrong, would God hinder him going about to curse, as he did* Balaam, *or make him retract his judgment, as the Counsel given by* Nathan *the Prophet to King* David? *It is not certain.* Nay that it is absolutely false, may be proved by many examples. Did *Benedict* II. Examine well what he went about when he condemned *Julian Toletanus* his Book, which he was afterwards forced to approve? Did *Vigilius* who sometimes condemned, sometimes defended the *Tria Capitula*? Did *John* VIII who notwithstanding his Oath, the Decrees of his Predecessors, and Sanctions of Three Councils, restored *Photius,* and reinforced the Schism?

[6] *Si contingeret eum (Pontificem) perperam procedere; an Deus eum volentem maledicere prohiberet, sicut impedivit* Balaam *an potius retractari faceret ejus judicium, sicut &c. Certum non est,* Tapp. loc. cit.

Another very evident Example of this is afforded by the suppression of *Sixtus* V. his Bibles, which alone might evince three things, that the Popes are not always sufficiently diligent in their Definitions, that they can err in any Decrees, and that it is not known when the requisite Solemnities are observed in the promulgation, which was my second Argument. The case was this. The Council of *Trent* in authorizing the Vulgar Version had desired it might

might be correctly and accurately set forth, leaving the Execution of this matter to the Pope. That this might be well done, great industry was used. At last after Forty Six years *Sixtus* V. published the Edition, prefixing a Bull to it, whereby he commanded it to be received by all men: And wherein having prefaced that *the matter belonged wholly to his cognisance*, and that all necessary diligence was abundantly used by himself, and the Cardinals and Doctors employed about the work; he *pronounceth by that irrevocable Decree, with the consent and Counsel of his Brethren, of his own certain knowledge, and the fulness of Apostolick power*, that this is undoubtedly to be accounted that very Edition, which was made Authentick by the Councel of *Trent*, and now approved by himself: And *by the Apostolick power delivered unto him by our Lord*, commandeth, that *every where and in all cases it be received for true Legitimate, Authentick, and undoubted; and all future Editions be corrected by this, and not the least syllable be changed, added or omitted upon pain of the greater Excommunication.* This certainly, if any thing was a question of Faith and right, being concerning the true Rule of Faith, and pure word of God. *Sixtus* also omitted no words, whereby he might make his Decree valid. Yet *Clement* VII. a while after undid all, revoked his Predecessors decree, suppressed his Edition, and publisheth another of his own, wherein he maketh more than 2000. corrections of *Sixtus* his Edition, as our Learned Dr. *James* hath in a peculiar Treatise shewed. To this so fatal an overthrow of the Papal Infallibility *Tannerus* [7] the Jesuit replyeth, that *Sixtus* his Decree was not Authentic, nor did oblige, because not promulged in the due form, that is not affixed, or at least not the whole due time, to the doors of St. *Peters* Church, the Apostolick *Chancery*, and in *Flora's* Field: And this he proveth by the here say Testimonies of *Bellarmine*, and *Ferdinandus Albertus* the Jesuit: Although in the printed Copies of the Bull the Messengers Names are found subscribed testifying that all the wonted Solemnities of promulgation were observed.

Ad nos totum hoc judicium proprie & specialiter pertinet. —— Hac perpetuo valitura Constitutione, de Venerab. Fratrum consensu & Consilio, de certâ sui scientiâ, & Apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine, —— Apostolicâ sibi a Domino traditâ authoritate.

[7] Tann. *de fide* Disp. 1. quæst. 4. dub. 6.

To this *Launoy*, [8] rejoyns that these are meer tricks to establish the authority of the Roman Court, and impose upon unwary men, if yet any can be found so foolish as to regard them. Hath Christ therefore appropriated the Infallibility, conferred on his Vicar, to Walls and doors, that his definitions cannot be infallible, unless these petty punctilio's be observed: That these pretences of *Tannerus*, *Vasquez*, *Bellarmine*, and others, *are madness and Foppery, frivolous*

[8] Laun. Epist part. 1. p. 144.

Deliramenta loquitur, Iberas nænias sectatur, & frivola Siculis gerris vaniora Theologiæ importat. Hæc referre me pudet.

frivolous impertinence, and shameful nonsense. That *promulgation signifies nothing to the Popes Infallibility; nor addeth any truth or falsehood to the definition, but supposeth it in them. For if it be false the Promulgation will not make it true, although it be published by a thousand Messengers, and affixed to St.* Peters *doors to all Eternity:* That Sixtus *in defining that, for which his Bull was abrogated, did plainly err; and that* Clement *in abrogating his Bull and suppressing his Edition ought himself to have believed this, at least gave others occasion to believe it.* Thus *Launoy.*

I might add it hath hitherto been believed that this Infallibility doth proceed from the Holy Ghost. But when should the Holy Ghost confer it? Surely, if ever, while the question is discussing and defining. Whereas now when the Pope hath done all that lay in his power, and nothing remains but only some petty circumstances of promulgation to be performed by servile and illiterate Messengers; then only, and not till then, doth this Infallibility exert it self; which makes the Pope fallible, and the Messengers infallible. For the first may pronounce somewhat false, the latter nothing but what is true. But passing by all these things, suppose this excuse well grounded. Yet have I obtained, what was to prove that there may be sometime wanting in the Pope that diligence which is necessary to define well. For this consists not in the circumstances of Promulgation, but in examining the question, inquiring the truth, and weighing the reasons. What if after all it be not duly published by Messengers: That concerns not my argument, nor hinders the precedent negligence of the Pope.

Besides, if without these solemnities of Promulgation no Bulls be obligatory, the authority of the Decrees of all antient Popes may be justly doubted of. For who can assure us that all these circumstances were then observed, when it is the height of folly to think they were so much as known. Either these therefore are not necessary, or the ancient Decretals are all void. But suppose they are necessary: That they are not wanting to this Bull of *Sixtus* the subscriptions of the Messengers do testifie. I know it is pretended that they were added by anticipation only to hasten the Edition. But that serveth my purpose as well. For must every one, that receive a Bull, suspend his obedience, till he shall ride post to *Rome*, and consult the Registres? And hence appears the uncertainty of the second condition required to the Infallibility of any Papal Decree. For if the Testimony of the Bull it self be sometimes

false

false, and we be forced to pick up the Truth from flying reports; how shall we be ever assured, that the Decree was duly Promulged?

One thing more we may observe, that even by *Tanners* confession some reported, that the Decree of *Sixtus* was really affixed in the due places, and taken down after his death. This *Compton* [9] also dares not deny, but leaves it to the Reader to be believed or rejected by him. But if the Bull was not taken down, till *Sixtus* died; then *Sixtus* erred as long as he lived, and promoted errour as far as in him lay; and what is the chief of all, used not the necessary diligence to avoid errour.

[9] Compt. *in* 2. 2. Disp. 22. Sect. 5.

CHAP. VIII.

That it is not certain, whether the Pope defineth according to his own mind, or against his conscience: and that this latter case may happen, is proved by many examples.

WE are not yet got rid of our doubts and perplexities. Those which we have already mentioned, are external, and obvious to the senses, if not of all, yet at least of some. Whereas here is one unkown and impenetrable to all but the Pope himself, to wit, his own Conscience. For to judge right it is required, that he pronounceth what he thinks is true, and not decree against his judgment for any fear or force. That the Pope notwithstanding hath not always such an assistance of the Holy Ghost, as constantly to withstand these attempts; I shall demonstrate by four examples, those of *Marcellinus*, *Liberius*, *Paschal II.* and *Eugenius IV.*

That Pope *Mercellinus* under *Diocletian*'s persecution did deny the Faith, publickly sacrifice to Idols, and was for that reason deposed in the Synod of *Sinuessa*; is acknowledged by Pope *Damasus*, or whosoever be the Author of the *Liber Pontificalis*, by *Nicolas* I. *Luitprandus*, *Marianus Scotus*, *Martinus Polonus*, *Gerson*, *Cusanus*, *Hosius*, *Platina*, *Papyrius Masso*, *Bellarmine* in the first Edition of his Controversies, *Baronius* in the second Edition of his *Annals*, *Amicus*, *Emanuel a Schelstrate*, and many others. I know indeed that some deny it, relying on the silence of *Eusebius*, and testimony of St. *Austin*, who saith the Donatists objected this to *Marcellinus*, but could not prove it. Whether the fact be true or no, it is enough for me that Pope *Nicolas* I. and many others thought so. *Baronius* [1] insinuates this, when

[1] *Non tanti sumus ut de Marcellini lapsu opinionem ore omnium diffamatam antiquare possimus; quæ & communi ferè omnium consensu apparent postea esse credita*, Bar. ad An. 302 Edit. Plant. p. 800.

in the first Edition of his *Annals*, where he endeavours to elevate the Faith of this History, he excuseth himself, for opposing *the common and almost universal opinion*. And *Natalis Alexander* [2] observes, that the Roman Breviary favours this belief. Whence it is evident, that this thing seemed neither impossible nor improbable to the whole Roman Church: which shews that according to the opinion commonly received in her, the Popes may possibly be moved by some vehement perturbation of mind to betray the Faith. *Bellarmines* [3] excuse here will not avail, *That* Marcellinus *taught nothing against the Faith, was no Heretick or Infidel, but in external act, for fear of death.* For (to pass by the accusation of the Synod of *Sinuessa*, that he did it for the love of mony) even this demonstrates what I was to prove, that a Pope may be induced by some perturbation of mind, as fear or covetousness, to violate his Conscience, and betray the truth.

[2] Nat. Hist. Eccl. Sæc. 3. Dis. 20.

[3] *Non nisi actu externo ob metum mortis.* Bell.

Liberius comes next, who after he had bravely a while resisted the threats of *Constantius*, either wearied out with the hardship of his Exile, or moved with the desire of recovering his See possessed by *Felix*; subscribed to the *Arian* Heresie, and the sentence against *Athanasius*, *Bellarmine* pleads much in his excuse: The sum of which is this, That *Liberius* his fault consisted only in condemning *Athanasius*, and communicating with Hereticks; that himself neither taught Heresie, nor was an Heretick but in external action; lastly that the Confession, which he subscribed, was orthodox, although the word ὁμοούσιος were wanting; and that according to *Sozomen* before his departure from *Sirmium* he published a Confession, wherein he condemned the *Heteroousians*. But this answer of *Bellarmines* is wholly insufficient. For 1. Whereas he pretends *Liberius* was an Heretick only in external act, that no less serves our purpose, as manifesting that a Pope may be wrought by his passions to pronounce in matters of Faith against his own knowledg and judgment. 2. If he condemned *Athanasius*, it was not because he was by the false accusations of the *Arians* induced to believe *Athanasius* guilty, but only that he might free himself from the miseries of banishment, and the fears of death: As *Athanasius* [4] witnesseth. In the first case he had only erred in matter of fact; but now he failed in constancy: Which also proves my assertion. 3. To communicate with known Hereticks, as *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth *Liberius* to have done, is to favour Heresie, and add authority to it. *Christianus Lupus* largely handles this *ad præscript. Tertulliani cap.* 41. where he strongly

7 Ὁ δὲ Λιβέριος ἐξ ὑπερβολῆς ὕπνου καὶ δι' ἀτιμίαν χείρονα ἔκλαβε, καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὸν ἀναγκάσαντα θάνατον ἔφυγεν Athan. Epist. ad Solit.

ſtrongly urgeth the example of the whole Clergy of *Rome*, who ſeperated themſelves from the Communion of Pope *Anaſtaſius*; meerly becauſe he had not denied Communion to a Deacon of *Theſſalonica* of *Acacius* his party, who yet was far from an open Heretick. 4. Where *Bellarmine* denieth *Liberius* to have ſubſcribed to an Heretical Confeſſion of Faith; this is manifeſtly repugnant to the plain Teſtimonies of the Antients. We ſhall produce ſome. *Liberius* [5] himſelf in his Epiſtle to the Eaſtern Biſhops (who were *Arians*) tells them that *he is convinced the Condemnation of* Athanaſius *was juſt, whom therefore he looked on as Excommunicate, and would maintain Peace and Unanimity with them. That he ſubſcribed at* Sirmium *their Catholick Faith expounded unto him by* Demophilus (an *Arian* Biſhop.) And in his Epiſtle to *Valens*, *Urſacius*, and *Germinius* (the heads of the *Arrian* party) ſaith, *I profeſs to hold Communion with all you Biſhops of the Catholick Church: And Excommunicate all thoſe which ſhall diſſent from this our Bleſſed concord.* St. *Hillary* [6] denounceth a threefold Anathema againſt *Liberius* for this Subſcription, and calls him *a Prevaricator of the Faith*, and in another place ſaith, *the Hereſie penned at* Sirmium, *which* Liberius *calls Catholick, expounded to him by* Demophilus, *&c.* And tells *Conſtantius*, that *he ſent back* Liberius *to* Rome *with no leſs impiety, than wherewith he had before baniſhed him*; intimating, that he had made him an Heretick. St. *Hierome* [7] in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, ſaith Fortunatianus *is to be deteſted, for that he firſt broke the courage of* Liberius, *and perſwaded him to ſubſcribe to hereſie*: And in his Chronicle relates how Liberius *worn out with the toils of baniſhment: and having ſubſcribed to heretical pravity, entred* Rome *as a Conqueror*. *Auxilius* takes it for a thing moſt certain. *Who knows not*, ſaith he [8], *that* Liberius *ſubſcribed to the* Arrian *hereſie?* which he repeats in another place.[9] The old Roman Breviary [10] in the Feſtival of St. *Euſebius* the Confeſſor,

[5] *Ubi cognovi juſtè vos illum* (Athanaſium) *condemnâſſe; mox conſenſum meum commodavi ſcatentiis veſtris.—Itaque amoto* Athanaſio *a Communione omnium dico me cum omnibus vobis pacem & unanimitatem habere. Nam—Dominus noſter & frater communis,* Demophilus, *qui dignatus eſt fidem veſtram & Catholicam exponere, quæ* Sirmii *ſuſcepta eſt,—Hanc ego libenti animo ſuſcepi*, &c. Liber. Epiſt. 7.

Me autem cum omnibus vobis Epiſcopis Eccleſiæ Catholicæ pacem habere his literis ſcire debetis, fratres chariſſimi.——Quicunque autem a pace & concordiâ noſtrâ diſſenſerit, ſciat ſe ſeparatum a noſtrâ communione.

[6] *Anathema tibi a me dictum* Liberi, *& ſciis tuis Iterum tibi Anathama, & tertio Prævaricatori* Liberi, Hil *in* Fragm. *Perfidiam apud* Sirmium *conſcriptam, quam dicit* Liberius *Catholicam, a* Demophilo *ſibi expoſitam*, Id. ibid. *O te miſerum, qui neſcio utrum majori impietate relegaveris* (Liberium) *quàm remiſeris*, Id. lib. *ad* Conſtantium.

[7] *In hoc habitur deteſtabilis, quod* Liberium *primus ſollicitavit ac fregit, & ad ſubſcriptionem, hæreſeos impulit*, Hier. in Fortunat. Liberius *tædio victus exilii, & in hereticâ pravitate ſubſcribens*, Romam *quaſi victor intraverat*, Id. in Chron.

[8] *Quis neſciat, quod* Liberius *Arianæ hæreſi ſubſcripſerit?* Aux. de Ordin. lib. 1. cap. 25.

[9] Lib. 2. cap. 1.

[10] *Cùm doleret* (Euſebius) Liberium *Papam Arianæ hæreſi conſenſiſſe.* Breviar. Rom.

faith

saith; *Liberius consented to the* Arian *Heresie*: To these produced by *Launoy* I shall add three others. *Philostorgius* [11] affirms that *Liberius* and *Hosius* subscribed against the *Consubstantiality*, and against *Athanasius*. *Sozomen* [12] saith that *Constantius* sending for *Liberius* ἐβιάσετο ὁμολογεῖν μὴ εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν ὁμοούσιον *forced him to confess that the Son is nót consubstantial to the Father*: Where may be noted the disingenuous fraud of *Valesius*, who renders ἐβιάσετο only by *cæpit compellere*, *he began* (or went about *to compell him*. Lastly *Peter Damian* [13] Writes thus, *Liberius is known to have subscribed to the* Arian *Heresie, deceived with the error of perfidiousness*, and saith, that *after he was become an Apostate, he lived yet six years*. Many things might here be added to confute *Bellarmines* Answer, which because they belong more immediately to the Controversie of the Papal Infallibility; I shall omit them.

[11] Κατὰ μὲν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου, καὶ μὴν κατ' γε τοῦ Ἀθανασίου ὑπεγράψαι. Philost l.4. c.3.

[12] Soz. lib. 4. cap. 15.

[13] *Porro* Liberius *perfidiæ deceptus errore* Arianæ *hæresi subscripsisse dignoscitur.* —— Liberius *itaque factus Apostata sex annorum spatia supervixit.* Pet. Dam. Epist.

The third example is that of Pope *Paschal* II. All the World knows what quarrels were formerly between the Popes and Emperours about the Investiture of Bishops. The Emperours would suffer no Bishops in their Dominions, but what received Investiture from their hands: The Popes excommunicated both the Givers and Receivers of it. While the Controversie was yet hot, the Emperour *Henry* V. takes Pope *Paschal* Prisoner, and extorteth from him a Priviledg, whereby [14] the Pope yields and confirms to him and his Successors the Right of Investiture for ever; forbidding the Metropolitans to consecrate any Bishops or Abbots, but what have been first invested by the Emperour. Many then cryed out the Faith was violated, and Heresie established by this concession, particularly *Goffridus Vindocinensis*, out of whom *Christ. Lupus* [15] cites much to this purpose. And the whole Council of *Vien*, over whom *Guido* Archbshop of *Vien*, the Popes Legate presided, writ thus to Pope *Paschal* in their Synodical Epistle [16] *We have diligently examined the Priviledge by the Emperour extorted from your Majesty* (for so they call him) *Therefore by the direction of the Holy Ghost we have defined laick Investiture to be Heresie, and condemned that Priviledge.*

[14] *Illam dignitatis prærogativam nos dilectioni tuæ concedimus, præsentis privilegii paginâ confirmamus, ut regni tui Episcopis investituram virgæ & annuli conferas. Si quis item* &c. *apud* Marcam *de* Concord, lib. 8. cap. 20.

[15] Lup. diss. *de laicâ* Antist. invest.

[16] *Privilegium, quod a vestrâ Majestate violenter extorsit, tractare diligenter curavimus.* —— *Igitur dictante Sp. S. investituram omnem de manu laicâ hæresin esse judicavimus, & scriptum illud, quod Rex a vestrâ simplicitate extorsit, damnavimus.*

Nor

Nor did *Paſchal* himſelf defend his action; but in a full Council recanted his Errour, acknowledged his Fault, recalled his Priviledge, and ſubmitted himſelf to the cenſure and correction of the Council, pleading that he was compelled to that ſin by great neceſſities, which being done, *Girardus* Biſhop of *Angouleſme* ſtood up, (as the Acts of the Council publiſhed by *Baluzius* teſtify) and in the name of the Pope and Council, condemned, abrogated, and excommunicated this priviledge, declaring the reaſon to be, becauſe elect Biſhops were therein forbid to be conſecrated, before they had received Inveſtiture, *which* (ſay they) *is againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and canonical Inſtitution.* Now let the Reader judge, whether that can be defended, which the Pope himſelf confeſſeth to be *pravè factum, wickedly done*, and which the Council defineth to be *againſt the H. Ghoſt and canonical Inſtitution?* If the Pope can by a ſolemn Decree permit wicked things, certainly he muſt be fallible, if not in Faith, yet in Manners, if not in the *Credenda*, yet in the *Agenda* of Religion. For what *Lupus* [r] pleads, that *Paſchal*'s fault was like that of S[t] *Peter* carried away with the diſſimulation of the Jews, *Gal.* 2. of which *Tertullian* ſaith, it was *a fault of Converſation, not of Doctrine*; that, I ſay, is wholly vain and frivolous. For S[t] *Peter*'s fault conſiſted wholly in withdrawing his converſation from the Gentile Converts. But who ever accounted Priviledges a matter of Converſation? The one may be performed by every body, the other by none but perſons in Authority. *A priviledge*, ſaith Martin Bonacina [r], *is granted by him, who can make a law.* So Azorius, Suarez, *and* Salas. *The reaſon is, becauſe a priviledge is partly a Law, partly a Diſpenſation of the Law.* *Paſchal* therefore made a Law, which was to be for ever valid. S[t] *Peter* neither ſaid, writ, nor decreed any thing. What more unlike than theſe two! Nothing can here be ſaid, but what *Paſchal* himſelf pleaded, that he was conſtrained with great difficulties. This I do not deny: and it proves my aſſertion, *viz.* That Popes may be induced by fear to decree againſt their Conſcience.

Scriptum illud, quod magnis neceſſitatibus coactus — feci, — ſicut pravè factum cognoſco, ita pravè factum confiteor, & omnino corrigi — deſidero, &c.

Nos omnes in hoc S. Concilio coram D. Papâ congregati — judicio Sp. S. damnamus, &c. *Et hoc ideo damnatum eſt, quod in eo continetur — quod eſt contra Sp. S. & canonicam inſtitutionem.*

[r] Lup. loc. cit.

[r] *Privilegium ab eo conceditur, à quo lex ferri poteſt. Ita* Azorius, &c. *Ratio eſt, tum quia privilegium eſt quædam lex; tum quia eſt quædam diſpenſatio in lege.* Bon. de legib. diſp. 1. quæſt. 2. §. 2.

The laſt example is that of Pope *Eugenius* IV. who having called

the Council of *Basil*, a little after dissolved it, and removed it to *Bononia*. The Council would not obey, but continued to sit: and consequently according to the Principles of our Adversaries became thenceforward unlawful. Wherefore *Leo* X. [t] in the Council of *Lateran* calls it *a False Counsel, or rather a Conventicle, which after that Translation deserved no longer to be called a Council*: Yet *Eugenius* [u] *revoked* his own dissolution, and pronounced the Council had, notwithstanding his Translation, been alwayes Catholick and lawful. Now the Council of *Basil* after the Popes dissolution was either lawful or unlawful. If lawful, *Leo* X. and the *Lateran* Council erred. If unlawful, *Eugenius* yet erred worse in legitimating a Council guilty of so great a Crime, as is Rebellion against the Head of the Church. For it cannot be said, the Council was really unlawful; but that *Eugenius* gave it that validity and authority, which it wanted, and purged away its Crimes. *Eugenius* himself professeth the contrary in his revocatory Bull of his Letters of Dissolution. Nothing therefore can be answered here, but what *Duval* [x] alledgeth, That this Bull was extorted by fear. *The Cardinals threatning, that unless he expedited his Bulls of adhasion to the Council, they would all forsake him.* This answer grants to me, what I was to demonstrate, that Popes may be prevailed on by fear to decree against Truth and Right. So that this being granted, as it cannot be denied, no Decrees of Popes are to be received; before we be assured, that the Pope was forced by no Fear or Threats to publish them: which can very difficultly be known, if at all. Besides, if Fear can extort a false or unjust Decree from the Pope; why may not any other perturbation, as Hatred, Anger, or Covetousness, do the same? Well saith *Canus* [y] in a like Argument. *He which will yield to Fear, must necessarily yield to Covetousness or any inordinate Desire.* Nothing therefore is more uncertain than the Papal Decrees. For who can tell, what induced the Pope to decree this or that? * *For what Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the spirit of Man which is in him?*

[t] *Conciliabulum seu potius Conventiculum, quæ præsertim post hujusmodi translationem Concilium amplius appellari non merebatur.*

[u] *Decernimus & declaramus præfatum generale Concilium Basileense à tempore prædicta inchoationis sua legitimè inchoatum fuisse & esse, &c.*

[x] *Respondeo* Eugenium, *cum hæc scriberet: tunc à quibusdam Cardinalibus perterritum, & ni Bullas adhæsionis Concilio expediret, se ab eo omnes secessuros.* Duvall. Anteloqu. ad Tract. de potest. Pont.

[y] *Qui metu frangitur, is cupiditate etiam frangatur necesse est.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 5.

* 1 Cor. ii. 11.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

That it is not certain, whether he who calls himself the Pope, *and is commonly accounted the* Pope, *be really such.*

THere remains yet another inextricable doubt. For ſuppoſe we have overcome all the precedent difficulties, and found ſome relief for ſo many uncertainties: It is yet to be inquired, whether he which makes the Decrees, and propoſeth them to be obſerved by the Church, be the true and lawful Pope, as he is commonly eſteemed. For while this be doubtful; we may juſtly doubt whether his Decrees be obligatory. Now this matter may by many wayes become uncertain. As firſt it ſometimes happens, that two or more do at the ſame time contend for the Papacy; all of which have their ſeveral Partiſans, by whom they are accounted the lawful Popes. Many ſuch Schiſms have been in the Church, whereof one continued near 50 years. The knowledge of the true Pope was then ſo difficult: that *Duvall* and *Maimburg* obſerve two Oecumenical Councils, thoſe of *Piſa* and *Conſtance*, dared not to examine and define the matter; but thought it more prudent to depoſe all of them, and create a new One. How then ſhall private men be able to know, what Councils themſelves could not find out? But neither then alſo, when One only claims the Papacy, and poſſeſſeth the Throne, doth it certainly appear, whether he be a lawful Pope: and that for many reaſons.

For in the firſt place if he be an Heretick, a Schiſmatick, an Infidel, or an Atheiſt; he cannot ſurely be Pope. For as *Turrecremata* ſaith well, *how ſhall he be Head of the Church, who is no Member of the Church? Gregory à Valentia* [1], and many with him, diſtinguiſh between an open Heretick or Infidel, and a ſecret one, aſſerting the firſt cannot be a Member of the Church or Pope, the latter may, for this reaſon chiefly, becauſe otherwiſe Confuſions and Dangers could not be avoided in the Church, if the actions of ſecret Hereticks and Schiſmaticks were *ipſo facto* invalid. Yet he acknowledgeth in the ſame place, that the contrary Opinion is held by the greateſt Men in the Church of *Rome*, *Aquinas*, *Turrecremata*, *Sylveſter* (who affirms this to be the com-

[1] Val. tom. 3. diſp. 3. quæſt. 15. punct. 3.

mon Opinion of all the Doctors) *Paludanus*, *Auguſtinus Anconitanus*, *Ulricus*, *Cajetanus* (at leaſt as to what concerns Hereſy) and *Alphonſus à Caſtro*. Whence this at leaſt is gathered, that *Valentia*'s Opinion is not certain, and the contrary not improbable: which is ſufficient for my purpoſe. For whether true or falſe, matters little in this caſe, provided nothing be certain on either ſide.

Further thoſe who imagine the Pope forfeits not his Dignity, unleſs he be an open Heretick, agree not among themſelves. Some think him *ipſo facto* deprived without expecting any ſentence, ſome not till ſentence is pronounced. But theſe latter herein ſhamefully betray the Popes Superiority to a Council, which they had undertaken to defend. For if a Pope fallen into Hereſy ſhall retain his Dignity, till he be judged and deprived by a Council; the Council will be thereby Superiour to a true and undoubted Pope. Again how ſhall a Council condemn a Pope for Hereſie; if it cannot certainly define what is Hereſie; which according to theſe Divines cannot be done by a Council deſtitute of its Head, ſuch as that Council muſt neceſſarily be, which depoſeth the Pope for Hereſy. But of that in another place. *Bellarmin* although far more wary and circumſpect than *Duvall*, thought the Pope by manifeſt Hereſie fell *ipſo facto* from his Dignity; ſo that by a Council he is not ſo much depoſed, as pronounced to be depoſed. But ſince that is called manifeſt Hereſie, which is declared by ſome outward ſign as Words or Writing, nor doth it matter whether it be manifeſt to few or many; there will alwayes remain a doubt, whether he who is accounted Orthodox, be not in his mind a Heretick, Infidel, or Atheiſt, and hath not revealed his Hereſie to ſome of his intimate Friends and Confidents. For that once ſuppoſed he cannot be Pope. Nay *Bannes* [b] aſſerts, That *he which ſpeaks out his Hereſy by words, although no man hears him, is not to be accounted a meer mental Heretick, but doth thereby incurr the Sentence of Excommunication.*

[b] Bann. in 22. quæſt. 11. art. 4.

If you ask, whether there were ever any ſuch Popes: The moſt noble *Jo. Fr. Picus Mirandula* [c] ſhall anſwer for me. *We remember*, ſaith he, *another Pope ſo eſteemed and ordained, whom good Men believed neither was nor could*

[c] *Alium meminimus pontificem creditum & ordinatum, quem tamen præſtantes viri putarent nec pontificem eſſe nec eſſe poſſe, utpote qui nullum Deum crederet, omne infidelitatis culmen excederet, &c. nam & aſſum eum affirmabatur domeſticis quibusdam nullum ſe deum aliquando etiam dum pontificiam ſedem teneret, credidiſſe. Et alium audivi pontificem, qui familiari cuidam aſſeruerat apud ſe animarum immortalitatem minimè creditam.* Pic. Theor. 4.

be

be Pope, as he which believed no God, and exceeded the utmoſt pitch of infidelity; as his Simony and infinite wickednesses did alſo teſtifie. And it is affirmed he confeſſed to ſome of his Domeſticks, he believed no God; even then when he ſat in the Papal Chair. And I have heard of another Pope, who affirmed to one of his Confidents, that he did not believe the immortality of the Soul. To this we may add the expreſs Confeſſion of *Coſter*[d] the Jeſuit; *We confeſs*, ſaith he, *the Succeſſor of* Peter *may be an Idolater, a private Heretick, and in ſecret exerciſe Diabolick arts.*

[d] *Fatemur fieri poſſe, ut Petri ſucceſſor idola colat, apud ſe fortè de fide non rectè ſentiat, adeoq; diabolicis artibus operam navet.* Coſter. Enchirid. Controv. c. 3.

Secondly, It may be that the reputed Pope be for ſome unknown reaſon incapable of that Dignity; as if he be not baptized, or hath not received Holy Orders. For the Council of *Florence*[e] hath defined Baptiſm to be *the door to the other Sacraments*; and in the third Book of the Decretals, *Tit.* 43. it is commanded both by the Council of *Compeign* and by *Innocent* III. that if a Presbyter whom all accounted to have been baptized, ſhall afterwards appear not to have been baptized, he be firſt baptied, and then anew ordained. Wherefore if he be either not baptized, or not ordained, he cannot be Pope. But either or both may eaſily happen, ſince to the validity of thoſe, as well as other Sacraments, our Adverſaries require the intention of him that confers the Sacrament, which can be known to God alone.

[e] *Janua Sacramentorum.*

Thirdly, It may be that he who is commonly accounted Pope, may be unduly created, and for ſome Canonical impediment, manifeſt or occult, be uncapable of the Papacy. *For*, ſaith *Lupus*[f], *all Canonical irregularities of the perſon are not taken away by Election to the Popedom.* For which reaſon he there obſerveth *Pope* Conſtantine *was juſtly depoſed, as being of a Lay-man immediately made Pope; whereby he became irregular by the Canon of* Sardica: *and that, as is affirmed by approved Authors,* Clement VII. *dared not call a General Council againſt the Lutherans; becauſe being a Baſtard, he feared to be declared irregular.*

[f] *Neque enim gravis canonica perſonæ vitia per Papalem electionem ſanantur.* Lup. Schol. ad Conc. VIII. p. 1354.

Fourthly, He who is elected Pope, may be *ipſo facto* excommunicate, and ſo not capable of that Dignity. So *Picus Mirandula*[g] tells us of *a learned and ſober man in his time, and he a Dignitary of the Church; who gave it for his opinion, that the then Pope was no Pope, becauſe he had exerciſed the Office of Pope, before he had been elected by two parts of the Cardinals; whereas the Canons provide that ſuch a man ſhall be ſo far from being Pope, that he ſhall be ren-*

[g] Pic. Theor. 4.

dred

dred uncapable of that Dignity, as lying under an Anathema. For the like cauſe it is reported the Jeſuits were reſolved not to acknowledge *Clement* VIII. for Pope, if he had condemned *Molina*, as he intended, becauſe of ſome flaw in his Election. It is an eſtabliſhed Rule of the Roman Conclave, That none be accounted duly elected, but who hath two third parts of the Cardinals Votes: Cardinal *Sanſeverino* had gained them, and thereby of right became Pope. But while they were giving their Votes in the Chappel, the diſſenting Cardinals crowded in, diſturbed thoſe who were taking the Votes, and perſwaded one of the other Cardinals to withdraw his Vote: whereby *Sanſeverino*, although duly elected, miſſed the Chair; and *Aldobrandino* conſecrated, who took upon him the Name of *Clement* VIII.

But theſe perhaps are very rare inſtances. Thoſe which follow are more frequent. It often happens, that the Election is not free, but extorted by force, threats, promiſes, bribes, factions, and the like arts. In which caſes the Popes themſelves have pronounced the Election to be null and irregular, and the elect Perſon an Antipope and Apoſtate. So *Nicolas* II. [h] decreed in a *Lateran* Council, *That all Elections procured by money, or favour, or popular tumult, or military violence, ſhould be null and void; and the Elect Pope accounted not Apoſtolical but Apoſtatical, to be anathematized by the whole Church as a Robber, and by any means depoſed.*

[h] *Plat. in Nicol. II.*

Non Apoſtolicus, ſed Apoſtaticus.

But *Julius* II. [i] is much more rigorous, who with the conſent of the Cardinals decreed and defined, *That Simony was true and undoubted Hereſie*, and that *in whatſoever Election that intervened by giving, receiving, or promiſing of money, or any other goods or Benefices, the Election ſhould be* ipſo facto *void; and the Elect, although he had the concurrent Votes of two thirds of, or even all the Cardinals, ſhould be no Pope, but made for ever uncapable of that or any other Eccleſiaſtical Dignity, and be held and deteſted by all Chriſtians as an Apoſtate, Simoniack, Hereſiarch, Magician, Heathen and Publican:* and that *the perſon thus Simoniacally elected ſhall never become regular, by any ſubſequent intronization, or preſcription of time, or even the adoration or obedience of all the Cardinals.* Thus theſe Popes, truly and wiſely. For Chriſt had ſaid long before [k], *Verily, verily I ſay unto you, He that entreth not by the door into the ſheepfold, but climbeth up ſome other way,*

[i] *Sicut de verâ & indubitatâ hæreſi.*

Tanquam Apoſtaticus, Simoniacus, Hæreſiarcha, Magus, Ethnicus, & Publicanus vitari.

Nec hujuſmodi Simoniacè electus per ſubſequentem ipſius intronizationem, ſeu temporis curſum, aut etiam omnium Cardinalium adorationem ſeu obedientiam ullo unquam tempore convaleſcat. Habetur apud Raynald.

[k] John x. 1.

way, *the same is a thief and a robber.* And the Apostle after him [l], *No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.* Whosoever therefore obtain the Popedom by evil arts; and enter not by the Door, but leap into the Chair by wickedness, are no lawful Pastors, but Thieves, and Robbers, and ravening Wolves. [l] Hebr. v. 4.

But you will say, Were there ever such Popes? I answer: why not? Certainly the very Constitutions of *Nicolas*, and *Julius*, and others, which might be added, prove it is possible, and insinuate it hath sometimes happened. For those things are not wont to be forbidden, which cannot be performed: and it is a received Maxim, That *good Laws arise from bad Actions.* But we want not frequent Examples. For to pass by what we before related out of *Picus Mirandula*, who knows not that *Vigilius* obtained the Popedom by three most hainous crimes, by the violent expulsion of his Predecessor *Silverius*, whom falsly accusing of Treason, he procured to be banished into the Island of *Palmeria*, and there starved him to Death, or as others say, assassinated him; by promising to the Empress *Theodora*, he would establish the *Eutychian* Heresy; and by notorious Simony, giving to *Belisarius* two Centenaries of Gold? These things are accurately described by *Liberatus*, and after him by *Baronius*. Nor doth what *Baronius* [m], *Binius* [n], *Ferrandus* [o], and others alledge to obscure this matter, avail any thing, to wit, that *Vigilius* after *Silverius* his death resigned the Popedom, and would not resume it till he was canonically elected. For to omit the insufficiency of this excuse, since *Vigilius* and all his adhærents were excommunicated by *Silverius*, and so even these pretended Canonical Electors became excommunicate; to pass by this, the pretence it self is false, being related by no one Writer of those or the following times. They produce only *Anastasius* saying that the See of *Silverius* was vacant six days. But this, say they, could not be while *Silverius* was alive, for he was all along the lawful Pope. *Ergo*, after his death *Vigilius* resigned, and was chosen anew. A worthy Argument! As if those who write the lives of Popes, are not wont to assign to them only that time, wherein they quietly enjoyed their Dignities *Papebrochius* observeth this: *Baronius*, saith he [p], *making* Silverius *his Popedom to last four years, defers his Death to the* *Ex malis meritis bona leges.*

[m] Bar. *ad ann.* 540.
[n] Bin. *in* Vigil.
[o] Ferr. *Traite de l' Eglise* chap. 3.

[p] Baronius *integrum quadriennium faciens durare Pontificatum* Silverii, *&c. Sed malumus juxta modum loquendi Catalogorum veterum jam alibi observatum plus uno vice solum, id tempus numerare, quo* Romæ *sedit; licèt, &c.* Pap. Propyl. *ad mens.* Maium in Vigil. dissert. 13.

year 540. *But we rather chuſe according to the uſual ſtyle of the antient Catalogues, more than once obſerved before, to reckon only that time while he ſate at* Rome; *although he never ceaſed to be Pope by the injury he ſuffered.* But to take away all pretence, I ſay, that *Anaſtaſius* not only might reſpect the time of his depoſition, and not of his death, but that alſo he really did ſo. For to whom doth *Anaſtaſius* reckon the two years, or thereabouts, wherein according to *Baronius*, *Vigilius* poſſeſſed the See of *Silverius* yet alive? They ſay to *Silverius*, I ſay to *Vigilius*, and demonſtrate it paſt all doubt. For if *Anaſtaſius* had aſſigned thoſe two years to *Silverius*; he would have given to him in all above three years, to wit, thoſe two years, and the ſeventeen months, that he enjoyed his See quietly. Yet he reckons thus in the whole, [q] *Silverius ſat one year, five months, and eleven days*; aſſigning to him only that time which paſſed between his Election and Expulſion. The caſe is no leſs clear in *Vigilius*. *Baronius* computes, that almoſt eighteen years paſſed from the Ejection of *Silverius* to the death of *Vigilius*. Juſt ſo many doth *Anaſtaſius* aſſign to *Vigilius* his Papacy. *He ſat*, ſaith he [r], *ſeventeen years, ſix months, twenty ſix dayes.* 'Tis manifeſt therefore *Anaſtaſius* aſſigns the time that *Silverius* ſurvived his Expulſion, to the Popedom of *Vigilius*; and conſequently that theſe ſix days of vacancy of the See, immediately followed not the Death, but the Expulſion of *Silverius*. So that this whole ſtory of the Reſignation and new Election of *Vigilius* is a meer Fable. Nor doth *Papebrochius* deny this, *This Reſignation*, ſaith he [t], *is aſſerted gratis, as not neceſſary for* Vigilius, *who could not want ſpecious reaſons to declare the Conſecration of* Silverius *null, as made againſt the Canons, and not certainly enough purged by the ſubſequent conſent of the Clergy, which ſeemed not wholly free, but extorted by fear.* Thus he, whereby inſtead of one Example of Simony he hath given me two, of *Vigilius* whom he doth not ſufficiently purge, and of *Silverius*. He doth not clear *Vigilius*; for whatſoever *Silverius* was, he ought not to have been falſly accuſed, oppreſſed, baniſhed, and murdered by the procurement of *Vigilius*. Beſides the promiſes made to *Theodora*, and the Money given to *Beliſarius* make him guilty of Simony, although the See had been duly vacant, or *Silverius* dead. Now for what *Papebrochius* inſinuates of *Silverius* his

[q] *Sedit annum unum, menſes quinque, dies undecim.*

[r] *Sedit annos* XVII. *menſes* VI. *dies* XXVI.

[t] *Sed gratis aſſeritur renunciatio minimè neceſſaria ei, cui cauſæ non deerant in ſpeciem juſtæ ob quas poterat judicare ordinationem* Silverii *nullam fuiſſe, utpote contra Canones factam, nec per ſubſecutum Cleri conſenſum ſatis certò purgatam, cùm neque hic totus liber videretur, ſed metu extortus.* Id. ibid.

his Simony, *Liberatus* writes that *Theodatus* King of the *Goths* by violence forced the Clergy to Elect him. So one *Simoniack* succeeded another; one *Usurper* followed another.

But of this enough. Of the Popes of the X. Age let *Genebrard* speak. An Age, saith he [t], *unhappy in this one thing, that for almost* 150 *years about* 50 *Popes together, from* John VII. *to Leo* IX. *degenerated wholly from the vertue of their Predecessors; and ought rather to be called Renegadoes and Apostates, than Apostolick; since they entred not in by the Gate, but by the back Door, viz. by the Tyranny of the Emperours.* And in another place, *The Popes of that time, as intruded rather by the Emperours, than chosen, were monsters.* Or let *Baronius* [u] be heard. *What was then the face of the Church of* Rome? *how very ugly! when impudent and filthy Whores governed all at* Rome; *who changed Sees at their pleasure, disposed of Bishopricks, and what is dreadful to speak, intruded their Gallants into the See of* Peter. *No mention then made of the Clergy electing or consenting, the Canons were all trod under foot, Decrees of Popes despised, the Antient Traditions turned out of Doors, and the Old Customs, Sacred Rites, and former use of Electing Popes wholly extinct.* Hence at every turn he calls the Popes of these times *Intruders* and *Usurpers*, and at the year 897, saith, [x] *Boniface was driven out by Stephen, one Intruder by another.*

[t] *Seculum hoc uno infelix, quòd per annos ferè* CL. *Pontifices circiter* L.—— *à virtute majorum prorsus defecerint; Apostatici, Apostaticive potius, quàm Apostolici, quando non per ostium, sed per posticum, i.e. Imperatorum tyrannidem ingrediebantur.* Genebr. Chron. ad an. 901. *Istius temporis pontifices, ut intrusi ab Impp. potius quàm electi, monstra erant.* Id. ad an. 107.

[u] *Quæ tunc facies S. Romanæ Eccl.-siæ? quàm fœdissima! cùm Romæ dominarentur impotentissimæ atque sordidissimæ meretrices, quarum arbitrio mutarentur sedes, darentur Episcopi, & quod auditu horrendum & infandum est, intruderentur in sedem Petri earum amasii Pseudo-Pontifices. Nunquam Cleri eligentis vel consentientis postea aliqua mentio: Canones omnes pressi silentio; Decreta Pontificum suffocata; proscriptæ antiquæ traditiones, veteresq; in eligendo pontifice consuetudines, sacrique ritus, & pristinus usus, prorsus extincti.* Bar. ad an. 908.

[x] *Intrusus ab intruso.*

But to descend to particulars. Then was that infamous and scandalous Controversie about the Popedom of *Formosus*. *John* VIII. had deposed him from the Bishoprick of *Porto*. *Marinus* restored him. Afterwards himself was Elected Pope, and held the Chair six years; in which time he held a General Council, and was acknowledged by the whole World. Yet after his death his Successor *Stephen* VI. calls a Council, abrogates all his Decrees, annuls his Ordinations, diggs his Body out of the Grave, puts on it the Pontifical Robes, and set it in the Papal Chair, then solemnly deprives and degrades it, and having cut off his three fore-fingers (wherewith he performed Ordinations) cast

it into *Tyber*. *John* IX. who comes next, calls a new Synod, annuls whatsoever *Stephen* had done; and restoreth the memory and Decrees of *Formosus*. *Sergius* a while after anathematized *Formosus* anew, and abrogated whatsoever had been done in his favour by *John*. This occasioned *Auxilius* a Writer of those times to compose his Dialogue *against the intestine discord of the Church of* Rome (to use *Sigebert Gemblacensis*'s [y] words) viz. *concerning the Ordinations, Exordinations, and Superordinations of the Popes of* Rome, *and the Exordinations and Superordinations of those ordained by them*. And *Baronius* [z], is forced to say, *These things were done by Intruders and Usurpers of the Apostolick Throne; which lawful Popes have detested.*

[y] *Contra intestinam discordiam Romanæ Ecclesiæ, sc. de ordinationibus, exordinat. & superordinat. Romanorum Pontificum, & ordinatorum ab eis exordinationibus & superordinat.* Sigebert. de Script. Eccl. cap. 112.

[z] *Hæc perpetrata ab intrusis & usurpantibus thronum Apostolicum, quæ legitimi Pontifices sunt execrati.* Bar. ad an. 908.

In the next Age the words of *Platina* deserve to be observed. *The Papacy*, saith he [a], *was come to that; that he who exceeded, not in Piety and Learning, but, in Bribes and Ambition, obtained that dignity, good Men being oppressed and rejected: which custom would to God our Ages had not sometimes retained.* In latter Ages the Simony of *Alexander* in procuring the Popedom, partly by ready Money, partly by large Promises; is at length related by *Onuphrius*, and *Volaterran*, but especially *Guiciardine*. And *Varillas* [b] tells us, that *Octavian Fregosius* Duke of *Genua* procured the Election of *Leo* X. by the sollicitation of his Emissaries among the Cardinals, and by detaining Prisoners in the mean while the Cardinals of the opposite Party; who hastning to *Italy* by Sea, toucht at *Genua* in their Voyage. There would be no end, if I should produce all the Examples, which History suggests. And if the known instances be so many, what may we think of the secret Acts of Simony? For this is a Crime, whose chief art consists in keeping it secret, and hiding it from the Eyes of Men. However what we have alledged, proves this may sometimes happen; and consequently that we can never be certain the same hath not happened, even when it doth not appear. And from all, which hath been said, appeareth the impossibility of certainly knowing, whether he which possesseth the Papal Throne at any time, be a lawful Pope; and such, whose Decrees may be securely believed and obeyed. Our

[a] *Eo tum Pontificatus devenerat, ut qui plus largitione & ambitione, non dico sanctitate vitæ & doctrinâ, valeret, tantum dignitatis gradum bonis oppressis & rejectis obtineret: quem morem utinam aliquando non retinuissent nostra tempora.* Plat. in vitâ Sylvestri III.

[b] Varil. Hist. Franc. l. xiv. 1.

Our Adversaries are here brought into great streights. *Duval* [c] confesseth, it is a great difficulty, and what hath excited no small stirs in some Universities. To solve this, they take different ways. Some deny it can ever happen, that an unlawful Pope should possess the Chair; and that it is of Faith to believe every particular Pope lawful. So *Suarez*, *Valentia*, *Arriaga*, *Raynaudus*, *Castrensis*, *Martinonus*, *Rhodius*, and others cited by them: and with reason. For if this be not of Faith; no Faith can be founded on their Decrees, as they invincibly argue. But on the other side, how can that be of Faith, which so many Examples prove to be false? Or on what foundation shall this Divine Faith be placed? *Suarez* and *Martinonus* answer upon the reception of the Church: and 'tis worth observing how they confirm that. *Because if it should be once granted*, saith *Suarez* [d], *that an errour of this nature can happen in the universal Church; it can be no ways true, that she hath a certain and infallible living Rule of Faith speaking to her in Christ's Name.* The same saith *Martinonus* [e]. Both add, that this errour would be equal to an errour in Faith: *For*, say they, *if it be an intolerable errour in the Church, when the whole Church believeth a Book to be Canonical, which is not; although that be but a dead rule of Faith; it would be much more intolerable to err about the living rule of Faith.* That they reason soundly, cannot be denied. For it is no less repugnant to absolute Infallibility to err about the living than about the dead rule. But this being admitted, I shall much more easily prove the Church can err about the dead Rule, than *Suarez*, that it cannot err about the living. That it cannot err about the dead Rule our Adversaries can never prove: that it can about the living, I will demonstrate. If ever any Pope was unlawful and irregular, surely *Vigilius* was. Yet he was owned and esteemed as lawful Pope by the fifth General Council, and by the whole World. Although he were banished, imprisoned, and publickly vilified by the Emperour for the refusing to condemn the *Tria Capitula*, and afterwards excommunicated by the Western Bishops for doing it; yet was he never denied to be true and lawful Pope. So in the ninth and tenth Ages those monstrous Popes were, by *Baronius* [f] his confession, *so honoured and reverenced by All the Faithful, that whomsoe-*

[c] *Duval. de Potest. Pont. par. 2. Sect. 5.*

[d] *Si talis posset semel dari error in universali Ecclesiâ; nunquam esset verum illam habere certam & infallibilem regulam vivam fidei sibi loquentem Christi nomine.* Suar. de fide, disp. 10. Sect. 5.

[e] Mart. de fide, disp. 5. Sect. 6. *Nam si error æquiparatur errori in fide——multo intolerabilius esset errare in vivâ fidei regulâ.* Idem ibid.

[f] *At, quod mirandum est, isti (Pontifices) licèt tales fuerint, tamen eo honore & reverentiâ si-*

deles omnes prosequebantur Romanam Eccl. ut quemcunque in eâ sedentem audirent nomine tenus Pontificem, eundem, mirum dictu! nullâ habitâ discussione ejus ingressûs, eum ut Petrum colerent. Bar. ad an. 897.

whomsoever they heard did preside in the Church of Rome, *although indeed but a nominal Pope, never enquiring into the lawfulneſs of his Election, they reſpected no otherwiſe than St.* Peter *himſelf.* In a word, all thoſe whom I mentioned before, were generally obeyed by the Church. The Church therefore can err in this matter. But ſee how *Suarez* and the reſt, by pretending the contrary, have deſtroyed their own darling Opinion. For if it be of Faith, that a Pope acknowledged by the whole Church, is a lawful one; then *Stephen*, *Romanus*, and *Sergius*, who condemned *Formoſus*, and annulled his Acts as not being lawful Pope, erred; and ſo farewel all Papal Infallibility. For they erred in the Faith; if it be of Faith that *Formoſus* was lawful Pope, as it muſt be according to theſe Divines; ſince *Formoſus*, while he lived, was acknowledged and obeyed by the univerſal Church; whereas theſe three Popes his Succeſſours defined, that he was no lawful Pope.

Duval perhaps was aware of theſe inconveniencies, and therefore took another method. He maintains it matters nothing, whether he which poſſeſſeth the Popedom, be true Pope or no; and that his Decrees will not be at all the leſs infallible. *We affirm*, ſaith he [t], *that ſuch a Pope eſteemed for true, can never err. For God, leſt falſhood be obtruded upon his Church for truth, will never permit him to err, and that according to the common and ordinary Law: becauſe the Pope is not for himſelf, but for the Church.* But there is nothing ſolid in all this. For firſt his reaſon is vain. For if the Pope be not for himſelf, but for the Church; no more are any other Governours of the Church. Shall therefore whatſoever they do be valid, although they be neither baptized nor ordained? To think ſo, *Suarez* calls Hereſie, nor will *Duval* allow it. Yet allow it he muſt, or elſe part with his Argument. Secondly, this is directly contrary to *Julius* II. his Decree. For *Duval* would have a Simoniack or irregular Pope to be obeyed and heard. *Julius* commands him to be looked upon as an Hereſiarch and Magician, to be diſobeyed, deprived, and driven out of his See. Thirdly, if we conſult Scripture, that forbids us to hearken to theſe Invaders of Church Offices. For our Saviour, after he had ſaid that thoſe which enter into the ſheepfold any other way,

[t] *Dicimus talem Pontificem pro vero creditum nunquam erraturum——ne in Eccleſiam falſum pro vero obtrudatur, nunquam eum Deus errare ſinet, & quidem ſecundum legem communem & ordinariam.* Duvall. de poteſt. Pont. par. 2. qu. 5.

way, than by the door, are Thieves and Robbers: adds [b], *And a ſtranger will they* (the ſheep) *not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of Strangers.* And in another place [i], *Beware of falſe Prophets, which come to you in ſheeps cloathing, but inwardly they are ravening Wolves.* Now *Simoniacks* and *Uſurpers* of Eccleſiaſtical Offices are theſe Thieves and Robbers, and ravening Wolves.

[b] John x. 5.

[i] Mat. vii. 15.

Now as for reaſon, that can never teach us, that we owe the ſame reverence to unlawful, as to lawful Popes. For contrarily in the Civil Government every man is bound even to diſobey a Tyrant and Uſurper, who drives out the lawful Prince. Beſides, ſince Infallibility is by our Adverſaries annexed to the Popedom as an inſeparable Priviledge; he that is no Pope can have no right nor claim to it. So ſaith alſo *Martinonus* [k] expreſly; *This Power and Aſſiſtance is given to none but a true Pope, to whom only it was promiſed in* Peter. And it ſeems indeed incredible to me, that any wicked man ſhould extort that from God by his Crimes, which he had annexed to a lawful ſucceſſion. As if by Wickedneſs he could obtain a right to the perpetual aſſiſtance of the H. Ghoſt; which had he been innocent, he had for ever wanted? Certainly the Antient Popes thought far otherwiſe. They never dreamed of purchaſing the H. Ghoſt by Simony, but rather imagined that would obſtruct his favour. So *Innocent* I. [l] ſpeaking of *Simoniacks*, ſaith, *They have loſt that perfection of the H. Ghoſt, which they had received. Neither can they give the fulneſs of it, which exerts it ſelf chiefly in Ordinations, having forfeited it by the perfidiouſneſs of their Impiety.* Gregory I. [m] *They which in the Temple of God preſume to ſell Doves* (by which, as in the words immediately precedent appears, he means *Simoniacks*) *their Biſhopricks by the judgment of God are become void; which error is propagated with increaſe in thoſe who are ſubject to them. For whom any one ordains for Mony, by ordaining he makes him an Heretick.* Which words he repeats more than ten times in his other Epiſtles. *John* VIII. [n] hath uſed the ſame Expreſſions in one of his Epiſtles. And *Peter Damian* tells us this

[k] *Hujuſmodi poteſtas & aſſiſtentia non datur Pontifici niſi vero, cui ſoli eſt promiſſa in* Petro. Mart. de fide diſp. 9. Sect. 6.

[l] *Perfectionem Spiritûs quam acceperant, amiſerunt. Nec dare ejus plenitudinem poſſunt, quæ maximè in ordinationibus operatur, quam per impietatis ſuæ perfidiam perdiderunt.* Innoc. 1. Epiſt. 18. cap. 13.

[m] *Quia qui in templo Dei columbas vendere præſumpſerunt, eorum Deo judice cathedræ ceciderunt: qui videlicet error in ſubditis cum augmento propagatur. ——quia eum quem quis cum pretio ordinat, provehendo agit ut hæreticus fiat.* Greg. I. lib. 4. Epiſt. 50.

[n] Joann. VIII. Epiſt. 94.

this was confirmed by a miracle. For a *Simoniacal* Biſhop could never pronounce the Name of the H. Ghoſt: on which he makes this remark. *For he deſervedly loſt the H. Ghoſt while he bought him.*

[o] *Meritò ſiquidem Spiritum S. dum emit, amiſit.* P. Dam. Opuſc. 19. cap. 6.

But to return to our Argument; what more incredible, than that an Atheiſt, Infidel, and profane perſon ſhould be infallible? Who would not wonder at a Pope pronouncing and deriding Oracles at the ſame time? Infallible and ignorant of his Infallibility? Teaching with certainty what himſelf thinks to be falſe? Surely if things be ſo; an irregular and uſurping Pope ought not in prudence to be depoſed: Since his Infallibility, as well as that of any lawful Pope, will ſerve to direct the Faithful, and confound Hereticks; and his Depoſition cannot be attempted without the danger of Schiſm. Laſtly I would know, whether when an unlawful poſſeſſeth the Throne of a lawful Pope; Infallibility belong to both, or only to the firſt. If to both, then in vain doth God diſpenſe ſo great a gift to the injured Pope, whom no Body acknowledgeth as ſuch. If only to the firſt, then the Priviledges of an Intruder will be more and greater, than thoſe of a lawful Pope; and Uſurpation will confer, what Canonical Election cannot. To theſe add the Arguments, which *Suarez* [p] produceth againſt this Anſwer: As, *That it incurreth the ſame difficulties it is brought to ſolve. For it is not more certain that a reputed Pope hath the Priviledge of Infallibility, than that he is a lawful Pope: Since both depend upon the common belief of the Church, and neither is revealed. Again, if he be only a Nominal Pope, he may be alſo only a Nominal Prieſt, and ſo cannot give Abſolution, hath therefore no right to all the Priviledges granted by Chriſt to St.* Peter, *becauſe no ſhare in the Power delegated to S.* Peter *in thoſe words,* Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, *&c. Farther that Anſwer is contradictory in aſſigning to the reputed Pope an inſeparable property of the Papacy,* (Infallibility) *and yet denying him to be Pope, that is, truly ſo.*

[p] Suar. de fide diſp. 10. § 6.

It is manifeſt therefore, that this Anſwer is plainly falſe: But let it be true. What ſtill if it ſhall be uncertain? It will be in the end the ſame thing; and we ſhall as eaſily obtain our deſign. For if I may doubt whether he be lawful Pope that poſſeſſeth the Chair; and alſo whether an unlawful Pope enjoyeth the Priviledge of Infallibility: I may then juſtly doubt, whether I ought to aſſent

assent to the Decree of every single Pope, and can never be certain of it. That the first is uncertain I have already shewed. That the latter is not certain, Our Adversaries will not deny. For if any, it must be the certainty of Faith; which *Duvall* will never grant, who denies even the Infallibility of a lawful Pope to be of Faith. If any one yet shall dissent from *Duvall*, and contend that it is of Faith: he may be convinced by the same Arguments, which we produced against the rest. He may be asked where God revealed it, or the Church defined it. He may be told that Defenders of the contrary Opinion were never yet accused or condemned of Heresie. Lastly, He may be put in mind of *Stephen*, *Romanus*, and *Sergius*, who declaring *Formosus* to have been an unlawful Pope, did also annull his Decrees. But I need not insist upon refuting that, which no man maintains. So that we may conclude there is no certainty to be had in this matter, and therefore that Faith cannot safely rely on the Pope's Sentence.

CHAP. X.

Wherein is prevented an Evasion, whereby Duvall *endeavours to elude whatsoever hath been hitherto said concerning the* Pope.

Duvall [a] oppressed with so many Difficulties, takes refuge in saying, *The Definitions of the Pope are not of Faith, before the Church, whose Infallibility is of Faith, hath received them.* I might justly rest here, since *Duvall* hereby grants us all we desire, *viz.* that faith cannot be founded upon the definition of the Pope alone. Whether the Churches Authority adds certainty to it, I shall enquire hereafter. In the mean while that the Truth may be on all sides more manifest, and because many things now occur not proper for another place; I will more accurately

[a] *Respondeo definitiones Pontificis non esse de fide, donec universalis Ecclesia, quam de fide est errare non posse, eas acceptaverit.* Duvall. de potest. Pont. part. 2. qu. 5.

ly consider *Duval*'s argument. And first, *Duval* hereby is not consonant to himself. For if the Pope's Decrees be not of Faith, till received by the Church, then the Pope alone is not a Rule of Faith, but an aggregate of Pope and Church together: whenas *Duval* in another place [b] teaches there are five Rules of Faith, the Church Scripture, Tradition, Council, and Pope; whereof every one is so independent and sufficient, that whatsoever it shall propose is most firmly to be believed: not to say that hereby the perfections of a Rule of Faith will appear much more eminently in the Church than in the Pope; since the Church can direct our Faith without the Pope, but not the Pope without the Church; whereas *Duval* [c] teaches the quite contrary. Herein therefore he is neither consonant to himself, nor to the other Patrons of Papal Infallibility, while he denies obedience to be due to the Popes Decrees, till they be received and confirmed by the Church: this being very near the opinion of the Sorbonists, those great Enemies of the Popes Infallibility. For the Faculty of Divinity [d] proposed their opinion in the year 1663. in these words; *It is not the judgment of this Faculty, that the Pope is infallible without the consent of the Church.* And the Clergy of *France* in the year 1682. determined [e], *That questions of Faith chiefly pertained to the Pope, and that his Decrees concerned all Churches: yet that his sentence was not irreformable, unless the consent of the Church had supervened.* How little doth *Duval*'s opinion differ from this? who maintains that the Popes Sentence is indeed infallible before the reception of the Church, but appears not so to be till then. For if so, whether fallible or infallible, it signifies not: in matter of practice it will be the same, and assent will be equally denied to the Popes Decrees, until they shall have been admitted by the Church.

[b] *Id. in 22. pag. 62.*

[c] *Ibid. p. 215.*

[d] *Facultatis dogma non est quòd Summus Pontifex nullo accedente Ecclesiæ consensu sit infallibilis.*

[e] *In quæstionibus fidei præcipuas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusq; Decreta ad singulas Ecclesias pertinere; nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.*

In the next place this Answer accuseth of rashness and imprudence the far greater part of the Church of *Rome*; which without expecting the approbation of the universal Church, blindly receives the Papal Decrees, howsoever yet uncertain. But that is of less moment. This I would gladly know, whether the Church, whose reception makes the Papal Decrees to become of Faith, ought to receive them without any precedent examination, or not

not till she hath accurately compared them with the Word of God. If the latter, then we have no definition, on which Faith can rely. For I dare confidently affirm, there is none, which the Church hath thus examined and approved. Few undergo that labour: most blindly follow the Dictates of the Pope. Not to say, that this is intirely repugnant to that profound submission, wherewith the Decrees of the Head of the Church ought to be received: or that according to this Principle the Pope ought, together with his Decree, to transmit to several Bishops the reasons of it; since without the knowledge of these they cannot be duly examined; or that the Pope is highly unjust, who without being first certified of their universal approbation, excommunicates and punisheth the contemners of them: I will only urge, that by this means the supreme Power is translated from the Pope to the Church, as which passeth the last and peremptory Sentence, not only on things to be believed, but even on the Decrees of the Popes themselves. How this will agree with the Doctrine of our present Adversaries; let them see to it. Certainly *Raynaudus*, and the Author [f] of the Treatise *of the Liberties of the Gallican Church* think far otherwise: of whom the latter bestows a whole Chapter to prove this very Proposition, That the Papal Decrees are not therefore to be obeyed, because confirmed by the Churches consent; but therefore consented to by the Church, because antecedently infallible.

[f] *De Lib. Eccles. Gall.* lib. 7. cap. 17.

But if the Pope's Decrees are to be received by the Church with a blind assent, and without any previous examination. I do not see of what weight such a reception can be; which according to this supposal must be granted to false Decrees, as well as true. Besides, such reception would not differ from Divine Faith, such as is given to the most authentick Revelations: and so this opinion would be repugnant to it self. For it supposeth Faith is not to be yielded to the Papal Decrees antecedently to the Churches reception; and yet requires the Church to receive them with a blind assent, that is, with Faith.

Theophilus Raynaudus useth a not unlike Argument in disputing against this Answer of *Duval*, which is now before us.

The definitions of the Pope, saith he, in matters of Faith, are received by the People either as to be believed with Divine Faith, and so antecedently to the Reception of the Church; or not upon their own account, but for the sake of the Churches Reception. But this is very absurd; because it is not in the Power of the multitude of the faithful* to make that be of Faith by their Reception; which was not *really such before. For then many things would become of Faith, which are by no means such; as the Assumption of the B. Virgin, which no Christian doubts of, and yet were believe to be of Faith.* He might have added other Examples: which we shall produce hereafter.

* *At hoc perabsurdum est, quia non est in potestate plebis fidelium facere, ut quod non est de fide sit revera tale.* Raynaud. ἀυτὸς ἔφα, punct. 5.

It may be yet asked, Whether this Approbation of the Church required by *Duvall*, ought to be express, that is, whether the Pope's Decrees ought to be positively received by all, before they become Infallible: for if so, there are few or no Decrees, which have been thus received, certainly none, whose Reception of this kind is or can be manifestly known: or whether a negative Reception will suffice, and so those Decrees become certain, which are opposed by none. But neither can this be certainly known, until we be assured, that the Decree is taken notice of by all the faithful. Whereas how many Papal Decrees are there, which are unknown to the greatest part of Christendom? And no wonder: since St. *Augustine* himself was ignorant of that *Nicene* Canon, which forbad him to be associated in the Bishoprick to *Valerius* yet alive. But that which is chiefly to be herein regarded, is that the certainty of this sufficiency of the negative Reception of the Church can never be demonstrated, and without that we are still at a loss.

This consideration also is of no small moment: That if it be lawful to deny Credit and Obedience to the Popes Decrees, before it shall be known they have been received by the Universal Church: hereby a wide gate is opened to Schisms and Dissensions. For then every contentious or capricious person may contemn and hinder the Execution of the most just Decrees; and so put an end to the Authority of this so much boasted Monarchy. For suppose the Pope publisheth a

Decree

Decree. Some admit, others reject it. Hitherto according to *Duvall*, it is not of faith, because not yet received by the Universal Church. What shall be done in this case? Must a Council be called? That *Duval* [s] himself acknowledgeth to be highly inconvenient, sometimes impossible, and for most part unsuccessful, That *if God had left only that remedy for daily emergent doubts, he would in a manner have obliged his Church to impossibilities: since the calling and meeting of a Council depends upon the pleasure of secular Princes: who for reasons of State may prevent it; although the Pope and with him all the Bishops in the World desire it.* But even if they meet, 'tis possible they may dissent in their Opinions. If you say that part must be adhered to which the Pope favours; I ask how it is to be adhered to; whether with Divine Faith? For of that only we now dispute. This *Duvall*, I suppose, will not affirm. For if the Infallibility of the Pope alone be not of Faith, part of a Council adhering to him will not make his yet uncertain Decrees to become of Faith; since according to *Duval* nothing but the Reception of the Universal Church can do it; whereas in this case the Approbation even of the whole Representative Church is wanting.

[s] *Pessimè Deus Ecclesiæ suæ consuluisset; si viam hanc, quæ raro fæliciter desinit, tanquam expeditum malorum indies emergentium remedium reliquisset; quinimò Ecclesiam ad impossibile quodammodo obligâsset.* Duvall. de Pot. Pont. part. 4. quæst. 1.

CHAP. XI.

That neither can the Faith of Papists *rely on the Decrees of* Pope *and* Council *consenting together.*

First, *Because their Infallibility is not sufficiently certain.*

THUS have we dispatched the three first Foundations of a Papist's Faith. The fourth succeeds, *viz.* an Oecumenical Council; which may be considered two ways, either

as disjoyned from the Pope, and deſtitute of his conſent; or as confirmed by it. The *Sorboniſts* hold the Infallibility of it the firſt way conſidered, The Monarchical Divines only the ſecond. But that I need not diſpute ſeparately againſt the *Sorboniſts*, appears for two reaſons: Firſt, Becauſe their Opinion is eaſily confuted. For we need oppoſe to them no more than this, that the Infallibility of ſuch a Council is not certain, at leaſt it is not of Faith, as we before demonſtrated it ought to be. For the *Sorboniſts* can never prove this to be revealed by God. Scripture ſaith nothing at all of Councils, eſpecially Oecumenical. They flee indeed to Tradition. But they cannot produce any Teſtimonies of the Fathers, that ſay this is of Faith; not any evident Decrees of Councils; not the conſent of the Univerſal Church, for the greateſt part of the *Roman* Church thinks otherwiſe. Beſides, the Oppoſition it hath met with among many Divines of the Church undeniably proves it not to be of Faith. For if the diſſent of a few *Sorboniſts* can cauſe the Infallibility of the Pope not to be of Faith; certainly the oppoſition of a far greater number of Monarchical Divines will produce the ſame Effect, as to the Infallibility of a Council without the Pope. Secondly, Becauſe it may be confuted with the ſame Arguments, wherewith I ſhall prove that the definitions of Pope and Council conſenting together are no firm Foundation for our Faith. For if both together ſuffice not, a Council without the Pope will never be ſufficient: Since the conſent of the Pope may poſſibly add ſome firmneſs to the Decrees of a Council, but moſt certainly can take none from them.

To ſuperſede therefore any further Diſpute of that matter, let us enquire whether the Faith of our Adverſaries can rely on the Decrees of Pope and Council conſpiring together. This many of them imagine. *Bellarmin* [a] and *Duvall* [b], glory there is no doubt of it among them; that it is unanimouſly taught by their Divines, and therefore is of Faith. But I deny both. For although the Monarchical Divines are of this Opinion, yet the *Sorboniſts* diſſent: who maintain indeed the Infallibility of a General Council, whether agreeing or diſagreeing with the Pope; but allow not this Prerogative to every Council, but only to a Council truly Oecumenical, lawfully

[a] Bell. de concil. lib. 2. cap. 2.
[b] Duvall de Pot. Pont. part. 2. qu. 6.

fully conſtituted, Canonically proceeding, and wholly free. The Monarchical Divines acknowledge the neceſſity of thoſe Conditions, yet differ from the *Sorboniſts* two ſeveral wayes. Firſt, In that they interpret theſe Conditions differently; as we ſhall ſee hereafter. Secondly, In that whether theſe Conditions be preſent, they would have judged from the ſubſequent confirmation of the Pope: which the *Sorboniſts* will by no means allow, but require the knowledge of it to be had ſome other way. Hence many Councils which the Pope hath pronounced to be both lawful and Oecumenical, the *Sorboniſts* will not acknowledge either for lawful or Oecumenical; as that of *Lyons* under *Innocent* IV. that of *Florence*, and the *Lateran* under *Leo* X. others which the *Sorboniſts* admit, and the Monarchiſts reject, as thoſe of *Piſa*, *Conſtance* (at leaſt as to the firſt Seſſions) and *Baſil*. So *Bellarmin* rejecting ſome antient Councils, as thoſe of *Sirmium*, *Ariminum*, *Milan*, and the ſecond of *Epheſus*, on pretence that they were not approved by the Pope, is ſaid by *Richerius*[c] to trifle in aſſigning for the cauſe that which is not ſuch: Since, as he affirms, theſe Councils were not rejected, becauſe not approved by the Pope, but becauſe wanting the requiſite Liberty. Not to ſay, that the *Sorboniſts* reject ſome Councils, meerly becauſe the Pope was preſent, oppreſſing and over-awing their Liberty. It is manifeſt therefore that the conſent of our Adverſaries about the Infallibility of Councils confirmed by the Pope, conſiſts only in words, and is not real; and that by a General Council the *Sorboniſts* underſtand one thing, the *Monarchiſts* another. The thing it ſelf therefore cannot be of Faith; ſince by the received Doctrine of that Church nothing can be ſo, but what is unanimouſly acknowledged and taught by Catholick Divines.

[c] Richer. apol. pro Gerſ. axiom. 22.

But to make the whole matter more evident, I will demonſtrate two things. Firſt, That this appears not to be of Faith from other Arguments beſide the diſſent of the *Sorboniſts* and *Monarchiſts*. Secondly, That although it were certain in general, there are ſome infallible Councils, yet it can never be known that any particular Council is ſo. This was demonſtrated above, although under other terms, when we proved that the active Infallibility of the Church is not of Faith:

Faith: and what I just now produced, confirms it not a little. To which may be added, That the Infallibility of Pope and Council together cannot be of Faith, because the Infallibility of neither separately is so. For I would ask, why that alone should be of Faith: whether because that only is true, or that alone revealed, or that only known to be revealed. Not the first: for then the whole *Latin* Church would have erred. For there is not, at least, not known to be, any, who do not attribute Infallibility either to the Pope alone, or a Council alone. Not the second: For then the same inconvenience would follow, since there are none but what hold the Infallibility of one of the two to have been revealed. Not the third; For who can ever imagine, that God would give Infallibility to Pope or Council, and yet not reveal it so clearly, as that it might be believed with Divine Faith. For he can have given it for no other end, than that it might be to Christians the Rule of Believing, which it cannot be, as we before proved, unless it be it self of Faith.

To this may perhaps be opposed, that the Infallibility of Pope or Council separately wants not Divine Revelation, but only the Definition of the Church proposing it. But if so, then the so much boasted of Wisdom and Assistance of the Holy Ghost must be wanting in the Church, which would not make this Revelation by her Definition to be of Faith, and thereby have left to the faithful no other living Rule of Faith than the Pope and Counsel consenting together, which for the known difficulties of calling General Councils cannot be perhaps had and applied once in an Age; whereas the Infallibility of the Pope, if defined to be of Faith, would be an apt and easie Rule, ready to be consulted upon all occasions. But in truth this Infallibility of Pope and Council united is no where expresly revealed by God, or openly defined by the Church. For many places of Scripture, and Decrees of Councils are indeed alledged for the Infallibility of each separately, but not one for that of both conjunctly. None certainly will deny this; if the Opinion of *Albertus Pighius*, and *Fr. à Victoria* be true: Of whom the first by the confession of *Bellarmin* [d] thought the institution of Councils plainly human, and found out by Natural

[d] Bell. de concil. lib. 1 cap. 3.

Natural reaſon: the ſecond * hath theſe words; *A whole Council can do nothing, which each Biſhop might not by his own power do of himſelf: whence this power is not in the Council immediately by Divine Right, but by the will of the Biſhops.* That this opinion is at leaſt probable, muſt be confeſſed. For no mention of General Councils is to be found in Scripture, none in the Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the three firſt Ages, to whom they were wholly unknown. If this opinion ſhould be true, that ſo much Infallibility would vaniſh into ſmoak. For who could aſſure us, that God had annexed ſo great a priviledge to an humane Inſtitution? at leaſt it could never be of Faith, becauſe wanting Divine revelation. I know this opinion is rejected by *Bellarmine*, but ſo ſoftly, that he doth not explode it as abſurd and intolerable; nor ſay the contrary is of Faith, but only more probable. From whence I argue, That if the Divine inſtitution of Councils be only more probable, then their humane inſtitution is probable: at leaſt neither opinion exceedeth probability, and ſo neither can be of Faith.

* *Nihil aliud poſſet totum Concilium, quod non poſſent Patres per ſe ſinguli ſecundum ſuam poteſtatem: unde hæc poteſtas non eſt in Concilio immediatè jure divino, ſed ex voluntate Prælatorum.* Vict. Relect. 2. de poteſt. Eccl. Sect. 1.

CHAP. XII.

That there was never any Councils Oecumenical.

THus have we proved the exiſtence of infallible Councils to be uncertain. But grant it certain and undoubted. This will be yet to be inquired, what thoſe Councils are; without the knowledge of which the certainty of the former will be wholly vain. Yet is this thing impoſſible to be known. For let us ſurvey the conditions which our Adverſaries require. The firſt is, that the Council be truly Oecumenical. This indeed is not much inſiſted upon by the Monarchiſts; who maintain any Council great or ſmall, confirmed by the Pope to be infallible: and ſo make no difference between particular and general

general Councils. For according to their opinion, without the approbation of the Pope both are alike fallible; with it, both alike infallible. Whence *Gr. à Valentia* [a] propoſeth his judgment in theſe two aſſertions. I. *No Council hath of it ſelf infallible authority of defining, laying aſide the Authority of the Pope.* II. *The confirmation of the Pope being added, any Council is infallible:* not ſo the Sorboniſts, they require the Council be truly Oecumenical. *The Sorbon*, ſaith *Richerius* [b], *aſcribes infallible authority of defining only to the Church, and a general, not particular, Council.* So *Holden* [c]: *Such a Council ought in the firſt place to be truly General.* This therefore is firſt to be inquired, whether any Council obtruded on us for a Rule of Faith, be General. Now I aſſert two things: I. That there were never yet any ſuch. II. That even if there had been, it would be yet uncertain, which were ſuch. The firſt I will prove in this, the ſecond in the following Chapter.

[a] *Nullum Concilium infallibilem authoritatem definiendi per ſe habet, ſecluſa Romani Pontificis authoritate. II. Accedente Rom. Pont. confirmatione Concilium quodvis eſt infallibile.* Val. tom. 3. diſp. 1. quæſt. 1. punct. 7. §. 45.

[b] *Schola Pariſienſis ſoli Eccleſiæ, & generali, non particulari, Concilio authoritatem infallibilem decernendi aſcribit.* Rich. Apol. pro Gerſ. ax. 22.

[c] *Primò, debet Concilium hujuſmodi eſſe verè generale.* Hold. Annal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3.

That a Council be truly Oecumenical, one of theſe things may be thought neceſſary: either that all the Biſhops of the World be preſent, or at leaſt thoſe who may ſufficiently repreſent the abſent. For who can otherwiſe imagine, that a few Biſhops ſhould authoritatively impoſe Laws upon the greater number not inferiour in Piety and Learning, at leaſt not neceſſarily inferiour. Certainly by the conſent of all, one equal hath no authority over another: and a few meeting together, do not by their conjunction obtain a right to preſcribe Laws to the greater number, although disjoyned in place, as a Learned man [d] hath well obſerved. We muſt therefore neceſſarily recur to one of theſe conditions. Yet although even the firſt ſhould happen, which cannot be without infinite difficulty, I am not obliged to grant the whole Church to be repreſented in that Aſſembly. For not to ſay, that would ſuppoſe that blind obedience which is forbidden by the Scripture; it may happen that in a Dioceſs the Biſhop be Heretical, and the inferiour Clergy Orthodox. In which caſe the Biſhop cannot repreſent the belief of his Church neither *de facto* nor *de jure*, unleſs we will ſay his Church was bound

[d] Thornd. Orig. Eccleſ. cap. 22.

bound to follow him in his Hereſie. But I will not inſiſt on this. Suppoſe ſuch an Aſſembly to repreſent the whole Church. Yet this cannot be denied, that ſuch an Aſſembly never was, nor any Council in which ſo much as the twentieth part of the Epiſcopal Colledge were preſent. And if ſuch a Council were never held formerly, when the whole Chriſtian World was ſubject to one Emperour: it cannot be hoped for in this preſent ſtate of Chriſtendom divided into ſo many Kingdoms and Commonwealths.

Laying aſide therefore this, let us conſider the ſecond way of holding a General Council. Thoſe who are preſent in a Council can no otherwiſe repreſent abſent perſons, than if they come in their name, and by their command, which may be two ways. Firſt, if they be expreſly and by name delegated; as if Provincial Synods ſhould be held every where before the General, and Delegates there choſen for the whole Province. Or ſecondly, if omitting all this, every Biſhop abſenting himſelf, ſhould for that very reaſon be thought tacitly and interpretatively to transfer his Vote and Authority on thoſe which go to the Council, *Richerius* and *Holden* ſeem to favour the firſt way, *Salmeron* the latter. For *Richerius* [e] having defined a General Council to be an Aſſembly of the whole Clergy collected out of all the particular Provinces, tells us this is not to be underſtood of every ſingle Eccleſiaſtick, but that *the readieſt way is to chuſe ſome out of every Order and kind of Eccleſiaſticks in every Province and Chriſtian Nation.* *Holden* [f] requireth that *ſome part or number of Biſhops may be deputed out of divers Kingdoms and Provinces; and be preſent in the Council.* On the contrary *Salmeron* [g] ſaith; *Thoſe who by a lawful hinderance or the permiſſion of the Apoſtolick See come not* (to the Council) *are ſuppoſed to have transferred their right upon thoſe which meet.* *Occam* and *John Brevicoxa* Biſhop of *Paris* ſeem to have conjoyned both ways: whereof the firſt [h] requires in a General Council *divers perſons bearing the authority and places of all the parts of Chriſtendom, unleſs ſome*

[e] *Promptum & expeditum eſt ex ſingulis ordinibus aut generibus Eccleſiaſticorum aliquos ex ſingulis provinciis & nationibus Chriſtianæ deligere.* Rich. Apol. axiom. 21.

[f] *Ut ita variarum Eccleſiarum in diverſis regnis & provinciis ſitarum pars aliqua ſeu numerus Epiſcoporum deputetur & interſit.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 9.

[g] *Qui legitimè impediti, vel ex permiſſu ſedis Apoſtolicæ non venient, jus ſuum totum in eos qui convenerunt cenſentur tranſtuliſſe.* Salm. Tom. 12. Tract. 77.

[h] *Diverſa perſona gerentes authoritatem & vicem univerſarum partium totius Chriſtianitatis, niſi aliqui noluerint vel non potuerint convenire. Unde ſi aliquæ provinciæ nollent vel non poſſent, &c.* Occam Dial. l. 5 c. 3.

would not or could not come. Whence if some Provinces would not or could not delegate persons having their Authority and Votes, the Council would be no less General. The latter [1] defineth a General Council to be *a Congregation, wherein divers persons bearing the Proxies of the divers Provinces of Christendom, meet Canonically to consult of the common good.* To which he subjoyns *Ockam's* Proviso concerning the absence of the Delegates of some Provinces.

[1] *Congregationem, in quâ diversæ personæ gerentes vicem diversarum partium & provinciarum totius Christianitatis ad tractandum de bono communi ritè convenient.* Brev. apud Laun. epist. part. 8. ad Amel.

However it be, the first way of holding General Councils is not observed by our Adversaries. For immediately upon the Summons every Bishop, who intends to be present, sets forward without expecting the Delegation of their Comprovincial Bishops. Nay rather both the Historians of the Council of *Trent*, Father *Paul*, and Cardinal *Palavicini*, relate that when the Viceroy of *Naples* would have had four Bishops of that Kingdom chosen and sent to the Council in the name of all the rest; the Pope took it very ill, and most severely forbid it to be done. Which I question not to be the reason, why *Canus* and *Bellarmine* in assigning the conditions of a General Council, never mention this. This express and formal Delegation therefore is not necessary to constitute a General Council; unless they deny the *Tridentine* and other Councils, in which it was not used, to be General. But neither is it valid, if it were used. For Bishops may be delegated either with an absolute and unlimited Power of giving their Suffrages as they please; or restrained to certain Rules of Voting on this or that side. The first way, though tolerable in temporal affairs, the success of which is of no great moment, yet is not to be endured in matters of Faith and eternal Salvation. For suppose the Delegates vote Heresie; shall the Delegators be bound to confirm their Suffrages? The second way of delegating destroys the liberty of the Council. For the present Bishops would by this means be no Judges of the Controversies proposed; and all disputation or examination of the Question in hand would be wholly vain.

The first way therefore of Representation is useless. Let us now consider the second. I affirm that the absent Bishops cannot be said to have committed their suffrages to the present.

For

For first, Although this may with some colour be said of those which have been lawfully and sufficiently summoned; yet it cannot be applied to them, who either are not summoned at all, or not by him who hath the lawful Authority to do it. Who this is, is yet undetermined. Besides, what if the absent Bishops shall openly protest they will not be obliged by what the others shall decree, as the *French* did at *Trent*; Shall they be also supposed to have tacitely assented? But to shew the vanity of this pretence more clearly, I will prove that tacit delegation, which in other cases may be allowed, to have here no place. First, it doth not appear what is the peculiar Office to be performed by the Bishops in a Council. *Holden* makes them only Witnesses of revealed Truths: Others rather think them to be Judges. But Judges they cannot be unless also Witnesses. For how shall they define an Opinion to have been revealed or not; unless they know it to be so, and be Witnesses of the Revelation, or at least Tradition. Yet 'tis certain that Proxies in witnessing are not wont to be allowed; or if they be, that a tacit delegation will not suffice. I add, if it were a matter of more external Discipline, or what concerns only the Bishops themselves; those who absent themselves might perhaps be supposed to quit their right, and submit themselves to the judgment of the rest which meet in the Council. But to imagine such a thing in a matter of Faith and Truth is most absurd. Shall those Bishops, who might have born Witness to the Truth, be thought to have forfeited or deserted their right; only because either voluntarily or by force they were absent from the Council? If this were admitted; errour would soon triumph over Truth, and Faith over Heresie. For our Adversaries confess, and Experience hath often proved, That the major part of Bishops in a Council may favour Heresie. For suppose the heretical Bishops nearer to the place of the Council, or supported by the favour of the secular Prince, or mightily zealous in the propagation of their Errour, all which advantages *Arianism* formerly enjoyed in the East. If to these be added the right of representing absent Bishops, they may establish Heresie in the Church for ever, and oblige the absent Bishops for a punishment of their negligence to subscribe to erroneous Definitions of Faith. Lastly, If the

abſent Biſhops tacitely delegate their ſuffrages to the preſent; there is no number of Biſhops ſo ſmall, which may not conſtitute a General Council, nay, although they be all of one Province; (provided the Summons were directed to all the Provinces) as being interpretatively inveſted with the Authority of all the abſent Biſhops. Which yet is not allowed by our Adverſaries: and *Bellarmine* [k] himſelf requires as the fourth condition of a General Council, *that ſome Biſhops come from at leaſt the greateſt part of the Provinces of Chriſtendom.* Let the Reader now judge, how that can ſtand, which *Richerius* [l] ſo poſitively affirms, That an Oecumenical Council repreſents the whole Church *moſt properly and perfectly.* On the contrary, what I have already offered, proves that the Church is not at all, much leſs moſt perfectly repreſented thereby.

[k] *Ut ſaltem ex majori parte Chriſtianarum Provinciarum aliqui adveniant.* Bell. de Concil. lib. 1. cap. 17.

[l] *Maximè propriè & perfectiſſimè.* Rich. Apol. axiom. 21.

CHAP. XIII.

That although there were Oecumenical Councils, *it would be always uncertain which they were.*

THAT there is no truly Oecumenical Councils, I have proved in the precedent Chapter! But grant there is, We ſhall gain but little, unleſs we undoubtedly know, which they are, that deſerve that Name. For the Papiſts will not have their Faith rely upon a Council indefinitely, but upon ſuch or ſuch a Council, as for Example upon that of *Conſtance* or *Trent.* But their Faith cannot rely on theſe, unleſs they were certain they were Oecumenical: which that they can never be, I ſhall prove in this Chapter. I might perhaps ſuperſede this labour, as being already performed by Learned Men even of the Church of *Rome*, *Launoy* [a], and the Author [b] of the Treatiſe *of the Liberties of the Gallican Church*, although with a different intention. For the firſt ſeems to have undertaken it only for the love of Truth, the ſecond that he might ſhew the neceſſity of depending wholly and abſolutely upon the Pope. But becauſe both of them have omitted many things; it will not

[a] Laun. Epiſt. part. 8. ad Ameſ.

[b] Ide lib. &c. lib. 5. cap. 2.

not be perhaps unuſeful to add mine to their Obſervations.

Firſt therefore, The difficulty of knowing Oecumenical Councils appears from the diſcord of Authors in numbring them. *Bellarmine* reckons 32 which diſtributing into 4 Claſſes, he makes 18 of them to have been approved, 7 condemned, 6 partly approved and partly condemned, and 1 (the *Piſan*) neither manifeſtly approved, nor manifeſtly condemned. *Boſius* [c] numbers 18, expreſly denying the reſt to have been General. *Bannes* [d] 15, or at moſt 17. But all omit that of *Siena*, although acknowledged to have been General by the Council of *Baſil* [e]. Again of thoſe numbred by *Bellarmin*, ſome are by other Writers expunged out of the Liſt. Let us view them in order. After the 1. *Nicene Council*, of whoſe Univerſality none doubts, comes that of *Sardica*, which is thought to be General by *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Perron*, *Lupus*, *Natalis Alex.* *Maimbourg:* denied by the *Africans*, *Photius*, and *Auxilius* [f] among the Ancients, by *Richerius* [g] and *Peter de Marca* [h] among the Moderns. The firſt *Conſtantinopolitan* Council *Natalis* [i] affirms to have been *only a Synod of the Eaſtern Church, and Oecumenical only* ex poſt facto, *inaſmuch as the* Weſtern *Church in the* Roman *Synod under Pope* Damaſus *approved it.* Yet in the year after the Council the *Eaſtern* Biſhops meeting at *Conſtantinople*, and writing to the *Roman* Synod, call their former Council Oecumenical: which *Valeſius* [k] doth not without cauſe wonder at, and obſerves the *Weſtern* Church did not of a long while after eſteem it Oecumenical.

I find none which deny the 1. *Epheſine* Council to have been General. Yet if any one ſhould do it, he would not want ſome foundation. For in the firſt Seſſion, wherein *Neſtorius* was condemned, not only the whole Oriental Dioceſs, ſubject to the Patriarch of *Antioch*, was abſent, but alſo the Legates of the *Weſtern* Biſhops were not yet come. *Cyrill* indeed ſupplyed the room of Pope *Cœleſtin*: but *Arcadius* and *Projectus* were ſent in the name of the other *Weſtern* Biſhops, as *Lupus* [l] obſerveth. In the following Seſſions the *Oriental* Biſhops would not be preſent; but making a ſeparate Synod in the ſame City, anathematized the other; which prevailed

[c] Boſ. de ſignis Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 8.
[d] Ban. Catal. Concil. præmiſſo Tom. 3. in Thom.
[e] Concil. Baſil. in quâdam reſp. datâ 3. Id. Maii, 1436.
[f] Apud Lupum Diſſ. de Concil. Sardic.
[g] Rich. de Concil. lib. 1. cap. 3.
[h] Marca de Concord. lib. 7. cap. 3.
[i] *Orientalis duntaxat Eccleſia Concilium iſtud fuit, nec Oecumenicum niſi ex poſt facto, quatenus, &c.* Nat. §. 4. par. 1. p. 236.
[k] Val. Not. ad Theod. Hiſt. lib. 5. cap. 3.
[l] Lup. diſſ. de Concil. Epheſ. cap. 6.

prevailed indeed in number and reason, and so may be called lawful, but cannot be Oecumenical. The Council of *Chalcedon* is acknowledged by all, yet as to the 13th Session (in which notwithstanding all the Canons of the Synod were made) it is rejected by *Baronius*, *Lupus*, and many others; because the Legates of *Rome*, and the Bishops of *Ægypt* were then absent; whereas the *Greeks* and others contend it was wholly Oecumenical. The V. Council under *Justinian*, which was the II. *Constantinopolitan*, is admitted for Oecumenical by all the present *Greeks* and *Latines*. Not so formerly; when the *Africans*, *Italians*, *Spaniards*, and *Gauls* rejected it. And certainly it was not Oecumenical. For *Vigilius* and the *Western* Bishops, although then at *Constantinople*, would not be present in it. The Council in *Trullo* is accounted General by some *Greeks* and *Latines*, as *Innocent* III. *Gratian*, *Bellarmine*, *Barnes*, and others; denied by *Baronius* [m], *Leo Allatius* [n], and *Bellarmin* [o] himself in another place. The II. *Nicene* is esteemed Oecumenical both by *Greeks* and *Latines*. Yet formerly *Hincmar* and even *Theodorus Studita*, that great Patron of Image-Worship, maintained it was only local; as *Lupus* [p] confesseth. Certainly it was denied to be Oecumenical by the antient *French*, *Germans*, and *English*, and by the Synod of *Francford*, who denied it could be called Oecumenical, when it was proposed to them, as *Peter de Marca* [q] acknowledgeth. Yea, and in the *Caroline* Capitular, they call it an Heretical, Schismatical, Erroneous, and Presumptuous Synod, wondering at the impudence and vanity of its Bishops in ranking themselves with the six former General Councils. And justly might they wonder at it. For although the Roman Legates were present: Yet the Western were not either by themselves or by their Delegates. Not to say that the pretended Legatas of the three *Oriental Patriarchs* were suborned by the Council, and had no Commission from those *Patriarchs*. That the Council of *Francford* was called General, *Baronius* [r] observes; Certainly *Hincmar* gave it that name. Nor doth *Bellarmine* oppose, although in another place [s] he calls the II *Nicene* Synod more Universal. However it could not be General; since all the *Greeks* (who were not yet divided from the *Western* Church by Schism) were absent. The VIII. Synod the *Latins*

[m] Bar. ad an. 692.

[n] Leo All. de perp. consensu.

[o] Bell. de Pont. lib. 2. cap. 18.

[p] Lup. diss. de Concil. Nicæn. II. cap. 15.

[q] *Proposita est sacro conventui Synodus Nicæa habita, quam illi Oecumenicam dici posse negârunt.* Marc. de Concord. lib. 7. cap. 17.

[r] Bar. ad ann. 794.

[s] Bell. de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 8.

Latins call Oecumenical; the *Greeks* deny it, as the *English*, *French* and *Germans* did also formerly. The *Greeks* on the contrary reckon for the eighth General Council the Synod under *Photius*, which is rejected by the *Latins*.

After these *Bellarmine* reckons eight other Councils elder than that of *Constance*, *viz.* four of *Lateran*, two of *Lyons*, and those of *Vien* and *Pisa*. But the Council of *Constance* [t] admits only one of *Lateran*, one of *Lyons*, and that of *Vien*: rejecting the other five. *Clement* VII. rejects yet more. For in his Bull of Priviledge for the Edition of the *Florentine* Synod, he calls it the eighth General Council; whereby he proscribes all these eight, the Council of *Constance* it self, and the *Constantinopolitan* under *Ignatius*, which commonly bears the Title of the Eighth: of these eight, that of *Lyons* under *Innocent* IV. was one; wherein *Frederick* the Emperour was deposed. This *Bellarmine*, *Onuphrius*, and the Assertors of the Pope's deposing Power contend to have been General. *Launoy* and *Widdrington* deny it. Nor is this a late Controversie. This very thing was disputed in the Synod it self between the Pope and *Thaddeus* the Emperour's Oratour, who appealing to a future General Council, was rejected by the Pope upon pretext that the present Synod was Oecumenical. *The Council of* Constance *is from the beginning to the end accounted General by the French*; as the Cardinal of *Lorrain* [u] expresly affirms, and the whole Clergy of *France* lately confirmed with a solemn Decree. The Monarchists deny it to have been General in the first Sessions; because of the three Obediences but one was present. So *Cajetan*, *Canus*, *Bellarmine*, *Duval*, and innumerable others. *Bosius* [x] and F. *Cotton* go farther; of whom the first reckons it not at all among the Oecumenical Councils, the second by the testimony of *Richerius* [y], wiped it out of the List of them. That the Council of *Basil* was always held Oecumenical by the *French*, the Cardinal of *Lorrain* witnesseth. The same was the opinion of *Eugenius* IV. *Bellarmine*, *Carranza*, *Labbé*, and others. *Duval* [z] vehemently opposeth it, and stifly contends it was never General. *The Council of* Florence *was never by the French esteemed either lawful or General*, saith the same Cardinal [a]. On the contrary,

[t] *In formulâ pii dei Pontifici eligendi præscriptâ.*

Vid. Labbeanam Concil. editionem.

[u] *Apud Gallos Constantiense Concilium in partibus suis omnibus ut generale habetur.* Comm. ad Britan. Senat.

[x] *Bos. de signis Eccl.* lib. 5. cap. 8.

[y] *Rich. Hist. Concil.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

[z] *Duvall. de potest. Pont. in anteloju.*

[a] *Conc. Florentinum perinde ac nec legitimum nec generale repudiatur.* loc. cit.

the

the *Italians* and *Spaniards* extol it to the Skies. The Council of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. *Fabulottus*, *Bellarmine*, and many more, contend to have been Oecumenical. Yet *Bellarmine* confesseth that some doubt of it; and *Duval* [b], That *others affirm it not to have been truly and properly General, forasmuch as there were scarce an hundred Bishops present in it* [c]. And himself a little after leaveth it uncertain, because of the paucity of Bishops: which reason might also exclude many Sessions of the Council of *Trent*.

[b] *Quidam aiunt non fuisse verè & propriè generale, cùm ei vix C. Episcopi interfuerint.* Duvall. de potest. Pont. part. 4. qu. 7.

Thus therefore it manifestly appears, That there are many Councils, whose universality was and is still disputed of; the *Latins* agreeing neither with the *Greeks*, nor among themselves. And if so: what certainty can be founded upon their Decrees, to which the very first conditions of an infallible Council is wanting? To this may be opposed, there are some Councils, which none deny to have been Oecumenical; as the I. *Nicene*, that of *Chalcedon* in the first Sessions, the VI. and the *Tridentine*. I own the consent of our Adversaries herein; and omitting many things, which might be replied, I will chiefly insist upon this, That this consent of our Adversaries is vain and destitute of all foundation, and would presently vanish, if they adhered to their own Hypotheses. For those conditions, which they require to make a Council Oecumenical, are not to be found in all these Councils; and besides, are such as create new scruples and perplexities.

[c] *Ut tot variarum Ecclesiarum in diversis regnis sitarum, pars aliqua seu numerus Episcoporum deputetur ac intersit, qui conventum communem ad eum universitatis gradum convenientem assurgere faciat, ut improbarum conjurationum, &c. absit omnis suspicio, &c.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 9.

First therefore, *Holden* [c] teacheth, that to constitute a General Council, it is necessary *some Bishops out of so many divers Churches situate in distant Christian Kingdoms and Provinces, be deputed and be present, as may make the common Assembly arise to that degree of Universality, as may exclude all suspicion of fraudulent Conspiracies and Factions; so that no prudent or honest man may doubt it to be Occumenical.* Many things may be here observed; as first, how many Bishops soever be present, we can never be sure there is no Faction or Conspiracy in the Council, how well disposed, or from how different soever places they come. What hinders but they may be corrupted at the place of Council? The Councils of *Milan*, *Ariminum*, and *Ephesus*

Epheſus are eminent Examples of this; yea, and the Council of *Trent* it ſelf: wherein F. *Paul* [d] relates, that the *Spaniſh* Biſhops complained there were preſent more than forty Biſhops obnoxious to and Stipendiaries of the Court of *Rome*; whereof ſome received thirty, others ſixty Crowns a month. Again, that when it was reported at *Rome*, that the *French* Biſhops were on their way to the Council, *Pius* IV. in a great fright called together the Biſhops waiting then at *Rome*, told them how neceſſary their preſence was at the Council, and perſwading ſome with promiſes, others with gifts, haſtily packed them away to *Trent*. The fear of this made the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* to decree, That the Votes ſhould be taken not ſingly, but according to the ſeveral Nations; *It being not reaſonable*, ſaith *Richerius* [e], *that in things pertaining to Faith and Diſcipline, the* Italian *Nation alone ſhould aſſume and arrogate to themſelves more than any other Chriſtian Nations.*

[d] Hiſt. Conc. Trid. lib. 6.

[e] *Nihil cauſæ eſt, cur in rebus ad fidem aut diſciplinam Eccleſ. ſtrictantibus una & ſola natio Italica ſibi plus aſſumat & arroget, quàm aliæ nationes Chriſtianæ.* Rich. Apol. ax. 8.

The number of Biſhops therefore affords no certain remedy againſt Factions. But ſuppoſe it doth: Is nothing elſe required to conſtitute a General Council but freedom from Factions? Then many National and Provincial Synods will become Oecumenical. Certainly Factions may be wanting in particular Councils, if many Biſhops be preſent; and perhaps Oecumenical liberty, if but a few. If that liberty contributed any thing, it would be only to enable the Biſhops to proceed Canonically if they would. But that is not the thing we now diſpute of. For particular Councils have been often ſeen to proceed very well, and Oecumenical very ill.

Secondly, *Holden* neither doth nor can define how many Biſhops (or out of how many Provinces) muſt neceſſarily be preſent; but leaves the matter to common prudence; the judgments of which are infinitely various and uncertain, whence no certainty in this particular, upon which all the reſt depend, can be had thence: eſpecially if we conſider that the Biſhops preſent in Councils are ſometimes more, ſometimes fewer. So the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* III. is ſaid to have had above a thouſand Prelates, that of *Chalce-*

don six hundred; the I *Constantinopolitan* one hundred and fifty; the V. *Lateran* one hundred; that of *Trent* in the first Sessions much fewer. So that Prudence can fix no certain rule here, and if she be satisfied when a great Number is present; she cannot but hesitate, when but a few.

Holden's Rule therefore is of no use to the knowledge of Oecumenical Councils. *Lupus* [f] comes somewhat nearer the truth; who requireth the presence of the Pope, all the Orthodox Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, and Bishops, if not corporally, at least by delegation, or express consent, whether previous or subsequent. The same saith *Bosius* [g]. But neither are they in the right, For if this were true; all Councils whose Decrees are received by the whole Church, would be Oecumenical, and so the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Neocaesarea*, *Laodicea*, *Gangra*, &c. (whose Canons were received both by the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, and confirmed by divers Popes and General Councils) would become Oecumenical. *This Explication*, saith the Author [h] of the Treatise *of the Liberties of the* Gallican *Church*, *confounds the idea of a General Council; and by resolving the whole Authority of it into the subsequent acceptation of the Universal Church, raiseth National, Provincial, and even Dioecesan Synods into the same rank with it.* This also would follow, That Councils, how frequent and numerous soever, could not be Oecumenical, till they were received by the Universal Church, and so those Councils would have lyed, which without expecting this subsequent Reception, intitled themselves Oecumenical; as almost all did, although many of them not received of a long while after, as the V. VII. VIII. of which before. Nay *Lupus* observeth the Canons of the first Council of *Constantinople* were not received before *Innocent* III. For more than 800 years therefore according to *Lupus*, that Council must have been Particular; nay both General and Particular. For the Creed of it was admitted by both Churches, the Canons only by the *Greeks*.

But laying aside these, Let us come to *Bellarmin*, who hath used more accuracy herein. He lays down four conditions of a General Council. First, [i], *That the Summons be General, and*

[f] *Dico adesse oportere sedem Apostolicam, omnes Ecclesia Orthodoxos Patriarchas, &c.* Lup. Differt. de Concil. CP. I. p. 306.

[g] Bos. de signis Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 8.

[h] *Haec explicatio Concilii ideam confundit. Hic enim ipsa ratione non solum, &c.* lib. 5. cap. 2.

[i] *Prima est, ut evocatio sit generalis, ita ut invitetur omnibus majoribus Christianis provinciis.* Bell. de Concil. lib. 1. c. 17.

and notified to all the greater Provinces of Christendom: For that this was alwayes observed, and for default of it the Council of Constantinople *against Images was declared void by the* VII. *Synod.* But how shall we be assured, that this condition was not wanting to any one Council either Antient or Modern, or that certain Intelligence was received in every Province of the indiction of it? Secondly, [k] *That no Bishop be excluded, whencesoever he come, provided he be known to be so, and be not excommunicated.* That this again was alwaies observed we cannot be assured. For not only those are to be esteemed excluded who are openly rejected; but those also, who privily by Threats, Promises, or any other way are forced to depart: as *Paulus Vergerius*, Bishop of *Justinople*, by publick Writing complained he was from the Council of *Trent*. The third condition is, *That all the Patriarchs be present either by themselves or by their Legates.* But to this *Bellarmin* adds, That *it is not very necessary; because the Council of* Ephesus *without the Patriarch of* Antioch *condemned* Nestorius, *and the Synod of* Chalcedon *concluded almost all things without him of* Alexandria. And at this time, saith he [m], *These Patriarchs are not necessary, because Heretical, or at least Schismatical.* But it doth not follow, That because one Patriarch may be absent, therefore the rest ought not to be present. Besides *Bellarmin* herein contradicts himself. For he demonstrateth the necessity of the presence of the Patriarchs by this Argument among others, because the II. *Nicene* Council proves that the Council of *Constantinople* against Images was not Oecumenical from the absence of the Patriarchs. If this Argument hold, the presence at least of some Patriarchs will be necessary. And whereas he denies the presence of the Patriarchs to be now necessary, because Heretical or Schismatical, this again creates new perplexities. For they deny themselves to be so, and 'tis at least very uncertain whether they are so: So that this thing must be first searched out and determined, before a firm assent can be given to the Decrees of a Council wanting their presence. See new Difficulties, new Labyrinths. Lastly, With *Canus*, *Duvall*, and others, he requires, That if not all Bishops be present in the Council, as they cannot all be; at least some out of all the greater Provinces meet there. If so, then must be

[k] *Ut ex Episcopis nullus excludatur undecunq; veniat, modo constet eum esse Episcopum & non excommunicatum.* Id. ibid.

[l] *Ut adsint omnes Patriarchæ vel per se vel per legatos.* Id. ibid.

[m] *Non sunt necessarii, quia hæretici, vel certè schismatici.* Id. ibid.

wiped out of the Catalogue of General Councils the II. and V. in which no *Western*, some of *Lateran*, and those of *Vien*, *Constance* and *Trent*, in which no *Eastern* Bishops were present. *Duvall* [n] opposeth this reason to the Council of *Basil*; which may with equal reason be returned upon all the rest. Beside, when neither *Bellarmine* nor any other dare determine how many Bishops out of each Province must necessarily be present, or how many Provinces may safely be wanting in the Council; the whole matter cannot but remain uncertain. That also deserves to be observed which *Bellarmine* admonisheth, That it was always thought sufficient, that when a General Council is held in the East, a few, suppose one or two Western Bishops be present; or as few Eastern Bishops in a Council held in the West: as he proveth by divers Examples. But if two or three Bishops can sufficiently represent one entire part of the Universal Church; why may not as many more represent the other part? Which being admitted, a Meeting of four or five Bishops will constitute a General Council, which to me seems very absurd and ridiculous.

[n] Duvall. anteloq. ad lib. de potest. Pont.

Hence it appears therefore, that our Adversaries can produce nothing satisfactory in this matter: which will be yet more manifest; if to what we have observed already be added, that they talk much concerning it, but prove nothing. Whereas they should not tell us, what they thought requisite or sufficient to constitute a General Council, but also demonstrate it so to be, and that so clearly, that no doubt might remain. Otherwise we shall be ever uncertain, which are to be called Oecumenical Councils, and which not. Yet nothing of this is produced by them: themselves rather differ about the conditions; and what one thinks sufficient or necessary, another rejects as insufficient or unuseful. So *Bellarmine* thinks it sufficient that many be present in the Council, and none excluded. *Lupus* denies this to suffice, unless the absent Bishops, either before or after the Council, shall assent. *Bellarmine* holds this assent unnecessary. For speaking of the *Lateran* Council under *Leo* X. he hath these words: [o] *But whereas it was not received, at least by all, it matters little. For*

[o] *Quòd autem non fuerit receptum, saltem ab omnibus, parùm refert. Nam decreta Conciliorum non indigent approbatione populi, cùm ab eo non accipiant authoritatem.* Bell. de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 17.

the

the Decrees of a Council need not the approbation of the people, since they receive not their authority from them. *Fabulottus* [p] and the Author [q] of the Treatise *of the Liberties of the* Gallican *Church*, maintain and at large prove the same things. Thus all things are uncertain among them, and hang upon a thread. *Martinonus* was not ignorant of this: who to proceed more warily, flieth to the Pope and Council it self; and maketh them, especially the Pope, the only Judges of these preliminary Questions. *To him*, saith he [r], *it belongs to declare whether the Assembly be sufficiently general, and whether those which are present, sufficiently represent all the rest.* But neither doth this suffice. For as to a Council, since only a General can infallibly pronounce in matters of Faith, and the Universality of the Council pertains to Faith, before we can acquiesce in the determination of the Council concerning its own Universality, we must know whether it be general. Otherwise we cannot be assured, that it did not err in that very determination. Besides, if this Judgment of the Council it self sufficed; all those were to be admitted as general, which challenged that Title to themselves. But some of these the Monarchists reject, as the Council of *Constance* before the union of the three obediences, and that of *Basil*: others the Sorbonists, as the *Florentine*, and the *Lateran* under *Leo* X. The same may be said of the Pope. For every one of these four Councils were decreed to be General by some Pope, yet none of them acknowledged to be so by all.

[p] *Fabul. de potest. Papæ super Concil. c. 5.*
[q] *Ubi supra.*
[r] *Pontificis est declarare, an congregatio sit generalis sufficienter, & an qui adsunt teneant locum sufficienter omnium aliorum.* Mart. de fide, disp. 5. Sect. 7.

CHAP. XIV.

That not all Oecumenical Councils are presently lawful: That it is very difficultly known which are lawful.

THus have we considered the first condition of an Infallible Council, *Universality*. The second follows of no less moment, That, *If it be lawful*. Our Adversaries confess, that the

the H. Ghoſt is not indifferently preſent in all Councils, how numerous ſoever. They acknowledge even the moſt numerous to have defined erroneouſly. They require them to be rightly and canonically conſtituted, and every way lawful. Whence as often as we object to them the Errours of ſome Councils; they think it enough to anſwer ſuch were Pſeudo-Councils, Conventicles of no value, not lawful Councils, to which alone they allow the priviledge of Infallibility. That the knowledge therefore of the lawfulneſs of Councils is very difficult, however neceſſary to give aſſurance to Faith relying on the Decrees of them, and that no true certainty is to be had therein, I here undertake to prove. And the difficulty of this knowledge may hence appear; That it is utterly unknown what are the conditions neceſſary to make a Council lawful. I never yet met with any one, who dare undertake to aſſign them, much leſs demonſtrate them. Some things may be found ſcattered here and there in treating of other matters, but nothing delivered *ex profeſſo*. Yet unleſs this knowledge were fixed, theſe conditions aſſigned, agreed on, and demonſtrated, and their number exactly determined, ſo as we might be aſcertained that neither more were required, nor fewer ſufficed: in vain will Councils define, the Infallibility of their Decrees will be always uncertain.

I doubt not, but if God had intended to tie our Faith to the Decrees of Councils; he would either have tied it to all indifferently, or provided that no unlawful Councils ſhould ever be held, or given us plain and manifeſt Rules whereby to diſtinguiſh lawful from unlawful ones. For to permit divers unlawful Councils to be held, to command the faithful to adhere only to the lawful ones; and all this while to preſcribe no certain conditions, aſſign no manifeſt Characters of a lawful Council, is highly repugnant to the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God. He might indeed juſtly have left this difficult inquiry to us; if it had been accommodated to our ſtrength and capacity. But the diſcord of whole Churches in aſſigning the lawful Councils, and conſequently the Errour of ſome moſt Learned men, manifeſtly evince it to exceed both. So formerly adhered to the V. General Council the whole Eaſtern and the *Roman* Churches; *Africa*, *France*, *Spain*, and the reſt of *Italy*, openly

openly and vigorously rejected it. Each of these Churches did then abound with most Learned and most Holy men; which proveth the thing to have been very doubtful and obscure, and difficult to be determined. The same may be said of the Council of *Constance* as to the first Sessions, *Basil*, *Florence*, and the V. *Lateran*: whose Lawfulness is to this day disputed of.

The difficulty of this matter can arise only from the ignorance of the conditions necessary to make a Council lawful. If these were fixed, the determination would be easie, unless the conditions themselves were intricate and imperceptible. The Monarchists, who assert those Councils to be lawful, which are called, presided over, governed, and confirmed by the Pope, all which are easily known; can scarce doubt which are lawful Councils; whence they all agree in numbring them. Not so the rest: who neither agree in assigning the conditions of a lawful Council, nor explain the necessity of each condition, nor demonstrate what they say to be true. For Example, the first condition given by the Monarchists, is, That the Council be called by the Pope. So also many of the Sorbonists: as *Brevicoxa* [a], who saith, *The Council ought to be called by the Pope, unless he be a notorious Heretick*: and *Richerius* [b], who affirms, *The calling of Councils ordinarily and regularly to belong to the Pope, unless he be distracted, or refuse to do it when desired.* *Launoy*, on the contrary, thinks it matters not by whom the Council is called, so it decrees rightly when met. Therefore after a clear passage cited out of *Maximus* his Disputation with *Theodosius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, he [c] concludes *the authority of Synods not to depend upon the calling of them, whether done by one or other, but upon the truth of their definitions.* Nor without reason. For if no Councils were lawful, but what were called by the Pope; then the ancient Christians had no lawful ones; among whom all those famous and holy Councils were called only by the Emperours: as *Launoy* and others have abundantly demonstrated.

[a] *Debet Concilium authoritate Pontificis congregari, nisi in casu in quo Papa esset notorius hæreticus.* Brev. apud Launoi. Epist. part. 8. ad Amelium.

[b] *Est Summi Pontificis regulariter & ordinarie generalia Concilia indicere & convocare; ita si rogatus id facere detrectet, &c.* Rich. Apol. axiom. 25.

[c] *Igitur non à Synodorum convocatione, quæ ab hoc vel illo fiat, sed à rectâ fide, quæ in Synodis sancitur, Synodorum authoritas dijudicanda est.* Laun. Epist. part. 6. p. 263.

The same may be said of the second condition assigned by the Monarchists, the *Presidence* of the Pope in the Council either

ther by himſelf or by his Legates. *Richerius* [d] and *Holden* [e] do not refuſe it; of whom the firſt teacheth the Pope hath a Right to preſide over Councils; the latter affirms him to be by Divine Right Head of all Councils. But *Launoy* in proving that the Pope preſided not over the firſt Councils, ſheweth that he thinks not this condition neceſſary.

The third condition is more difficult: which conſiſts in this, That *the Council be made up of thoſe who have a right to be preſent; and none others.* Who theſe are is not manifeſt. For firſt it is inquired, Whether Laicks be comprehended in this number? This almoſt all deny; yet *Peter de Monte* [f] Biſhop of *Brixia*, after he hath produced many places on both ſides out of the Canon Law, thence concludeth *this matter to be wonderfully doubtful.* Certainly in the Council of *Hieruſalem*, which many hold to have been Oecumenical, the firſt and the Pattern of all Councils, Laicks were preſent, ſubſcribed the Synodical Epiſtle together with the Apoſtles, and ſaid equally with them: [g] *It ſeemed good to the H. Ghoſt, and to us.* But to exclude them, and admit only Eccleſiaſticks, ſhall all ranks of theſe be admitted? This the Monarchiſts deny, and aſſert only Biſhops to have ordinarily the Right of a definitive Suffrage, and Cardinals, Abbots, and Generals of Religious Orders by priviledge. The ſame ſeems to be the opinion of *Holden.* Contrariwiſe *Gerſon* [h], *Lud. Alemanus* [i] Cardinal and Preſident of the Council of *Baſil*, *Almain* [k], *Richerius* [l], and *Vigerius* [m], vehemently contend that Presbyters, at leaſt Parſons bearing Cure of Souls, have a right to ſit in Councils. This is indeed a great Queſtion, upon which depends the validity of all Councils. There were ſome (as thoſe of *Baſil*, *Conſtance*, *Piſa*, and the *Lateran*, by the teſtimony of *Alemannus* an Eye-witneſs) in which Presbyters had a deciſive Vote, but far more (even all the reſt) from which they were excluded. If they have a right; all theſe laſt Councils are unlawful: if not, all the firſt.

Concerning Abbots there ariſes another doubt. They have ſat in Councils now for many Ages by Priviledge. The firſt who obtained it, as *Lupus* [n] obſerveth, was that moſt wicked *Barſumas*, who made no ſmall bawling in the *Epheſine Latrocinium.* But it is inquired, who had Power to give them ſuch a Privi-

[d] Rich. Apol. ax. 25. & 26.
[e] Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3.
[f] *Iſta jura ſuprà pro utraque parte producta reddunt hanc materiam mirabiliter dubiam.* Tract. de Monarchiâ.
[g] Acts xv.
[h] Gerſ. de poteſt. Eccl. conſid. 12.
[i] Apud Æneam Silvium, Hiſt. Concil. Baſil. l. b. 1.
[k] De ſup. poteſt. Eccl.
[l] Apol. ax. 21. 34.
[m] Comm. cap. ult.
[n] Lup. Tom. 1. p. 865.

a Priviledge. Certainly that Spirit which revealeth Truth, and as our Saviour tells us, *bloweth where it liſteth*, cannot be obliged by any humane Grant to confer Infallibility on thoſe, to whom he never promiſed it. The Monarchiſts themſelves acknowledge the Pope cannot confer on his Legates the priviledge of not erring. How then ſhall either Pope or Council give it to Abbots? But if they cannot; then are unlawful all thoſe Councils wherein Abbots ſat, thoſe eſpecially wherein they exceeded the Biſhops in number, as the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* III. in which (by *Bellarmin*'s ° computation) were preſent 1283 Prelates, of which only 473 Biſhops; and that of *Conſtance*, which among a 1000 Fathers had no more than 300 Biſhops. The ſame Queſtion is moved concerning Procurators of Biſhops. For 'tis juſtly doubted, whether Biſhops can delegate that Power of defining matters of Faith without danger of Errour, and transfer it upon others that are no Biſhops. For if not, all thoſe Councils will be invalid, wherein theſe Procurators were admitted. Now that they cannot, ſeemeth probable. For to omit that, the Monarchiſts affirm the Pope cannot communicate his Infallibility, and that Biſhops ſhould be able to do more than the Pope, ſeems incredible; I urge that this Procuration is not allowed even in temporal Cauſes. Judges are not permitted to ſubſtitute others who may give Judgment, and pronounce Sentence in their ſtead. And if this be thought inconvenient in judging the frail and momentany things of life; how much more will it be in defining matters that relate to eternal Salvation? Laſtly, delegated Judges can never ſubdelegate another; unleſs the Delegant ſhall expreſly grant Power of doing it. Let our Adverſaries therefore either ſhew where God hath given Biſhops power to conſtitute Procurators to ſit in Councils in their Name; or confeſs it to be uncertain whether thoſe Councils are lawful, in which theſe Procurators ſit.

° Bell. de Concil. lib. 1. cap. 5. & 7.

They will plead Preſcription perhaps for this; and urge that it is not probable a Cuſtom received and approved by ſo many Ages, ſhould not be lawful. But they have no Right to make uſe of this Argument. For *Widdrington* P in replying to that Objection of the Aſſertors of the depoſing Power, That Kings and Emperours have been depoſed by the Church, and therefore may be ſo; anſwers out of *Sylveſter*, That it doth

P *Aliud eſt facere de facto, aliud determinare quid ita poſſit fieri de jure.* Widd. contra Schulck. pag. 241.

doth no way follow, *it being one thing to do a thing, another to determine that it may be done lawfully.* And *Richerius* [q] freely reprehends many things observed in the Councils. Lastly, *Holden* [r] tells us, *That all Synods, even Oecumenical, may in some measure err in matters of Ecclesiastical Discipline, as most Divines hold.* If in those, then surely in things which they neither command nor define, but only tolerate.

[q] Apol. ax. 38.

[r] *Theologi passim affirmant posse quodammodo errare Synodos omnes, etiam Oecumenicas, in legibus ad Eccles. disciplinæ regimen spectantibus.* Hold. Anal. fid. l. 2. c. 3.

The Presidents of the Council of *Trent* were very much perplexed with this Question, and knew not well what to do in it. Cardinal *Palavicini* [s] relates how they consulted the Court of *Rome* and the ablest Canonists, and employed Learned men, *Scipio Lancelottus* and *Michael Thomasius*, to write concerning it. The Question proposed was, Whether to Procurators were of Right due a decisive Suffrage in the Synod? This they determined in the Negative; as well because it was not a matter of contract or private business, in which these Procurators were employed, but the common concern of the whole Church; as because they bore not that Office in the Church, to which God had promised the assistance of the H. Ghost in Oecumenical Synods. But because the custom of the Church was contrary, and some shew of Arguments appeared on the other side: the Legates thought not fit to determine this Question themselves, but expected to know the pleasure of the Court of *Rome*.

[s] Hist. Concil. Trid. lib. 21. cap. 1.

Thus much for the third condition. *Gelasius* [t] assigns many together, while treating of the difference of lawful and unlawful Synods, he defineth a lawful Synod to be that *which acteth according to the Scriptures, Tradition of the Fathers, Ecclesiastical Rules, and in defence of Catholick Faith and Communion; that to be unlawful which acteth contrary.* I inquire not now, whether all these conditions be necessary. I only say that it will be very difficult this way to distinguish lawful from unlawful Synods. For how few can compare the Decrees of them with Scripture, Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Rules? *Maximus* requireth much fewer things. For he would have nothing else inquired, but only whether the Council decreed rightly. For to *Theodosius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* objecting, That *the* Lateran *Synod held at* Rome *under Pope* Martin, *was not received,*

[t] *Secundum Scripturas, sec. traditionem Patrum, sec. Ecclesiasticas regulas, pro fide Catholicâ & communione.* Gel. ad Episc. Dard. epist. 13.

ceived, because not held by the Emperour's Command, he thus replieth [a]: *If the Commands of the Emperour, and not their holy Faith, makes Synods valid, then must you receive the Synods held by the Command of Princes against the Doctrine of Consubstantiality, as those of* Tyre, Antioch, Seleucra, *&c. For all they were called by the Emperours, but all condemned by reason of the impiety of the heretical Doctrines confirmed in them. For the pious Rule of the Church acknowledgeth only those for holy and lawful Synods, which the truth of their Decrees have approved.* To which *Theodosius* rejoyned: *So it is as you affirm: for the truth of their Doctrines makes Synods valid.* So they, and with them *Launoy* above cited. Which if it be admitted, the Controversie is at an end. None of us will deny those Councils are to be assented to which have decreed rightly. But how shall we know, whether they have decreed rightly. Here lyeth the difficulty, our Adversaries, especially being Judges, who are averse to all discussion, and affirm it to be above the capacity of the people. Which way soever therefore they turn themselves, they cannot deny it to be very difficultly known which are lawful Councils, and consequently which, although confirmed by the Pope, can afford certainty and firmness to our Faith.

[a] *Si Synodos quæ factæ sunt jussiones Imperatorum firmant, & non fua fides, recipe Synodos, quæ contra homousion factæ sunt, &c. Omnes enim hos Imperatorum jussio aggregavit. Attamen omnes damnatæ sunt propter impietatem infidelium dogmatum ab eis confirmatorum.—illos nrvit sanctas & probabiles Synodos pius Ecclesiæ Canon, quas rectitudo dogmatum approbavit.—Et dixit Theodosius, Ita est ut asseris; dogmatum quippe rectitudo Synodos roborat.* Disp. Maximi cum Theod. inter Anastasii Collectanea à Sirmondo edita Paris. 1620. p. 161, 162.

CHAP. XV.

That it is uncertain whether any Councils have been Free.

FReedom is so necessary to the being of an infallible Council, that all assign it as a condition, none omit it: and herein those two great Antagonists *Edmund Richerius* and *Andrew Duval* agree; of which the first makes this his XXII. axiom [a]: That the *Liberty of Voting is an essential condition wholly necessary to the Celebration of Synods, and so necessary, that without it the H. Ghost presides not over Ecclesiasticks met in Council. For the Apostle* [b] *saith, Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty:* and an Anonymous

[a] *Libertatem ferendi suffragii esse conditionem essentialem ad celebrationem Synodorum penitus necessariam, &c.*

[b] 2 Cor. iii. 17.

[b] *Numerosissima Concilia, qualia fuêre, &c. propter hanc libertatis carentiam illegitima sunt pronunciata.*

[c] *Caruit libertate Concilii necessariâ.* Duvall. de potest. Pont. part. 4. quæst. 6.

Author [c] of a Tract offered to the Assembly of the *French* Clergy, saith, That *most numerous Councils, such as those of* Ariminum *and the* II. *of Ephesus for want of this liberty have been pronounced unlawful.* On the other side *Duval* [d] speaking of the Council of *Ariminum*, saith, *It wanted the Liberty necessary to Councils*, and afterwards of the II. *Ephesine* Council, that although lawfully called, yet it proceeded unlawfully, being over-awed by violence of *Dioscorus*, in like manner as the Council of *Ariminum* had been by *Constantius*. The same saith *Melchior Canus* [e].

[d] Can. Loc. Theol. & lib. 5. cap. ult.

[f] *Incipit definitio Catholica habita ab omnibus Catholicis Episcopis, priusquàm per terrenam potestatem territi hæreticorum consortio sociarentur.* Hil. in fragm.

The Antients consent hereto. St. *Hilary* [f] giveth this Inscription to the first Decree of *Ariminum*; *This is the Catholick definition composed by all the Catholick Bishops, before that terrified with the Secular Power, they were joyned to the Society of Hereticks.* And St. *Athanasius* having rejected [g] the Decrees of this Council of *Ariminum*, because *extorted by contention and force*, and desiring a lawful Council, *Let an Ecclesiastical Synod*, saith he [h], *be held far from the Palace, where neither the Emperour is at hand, nor his Commissioner intrudes himself, nor any Judge threatens; but where the sole fear of God and institution of the Apostles sufficeth.* St. *Basil* [i] thought the meer relation of the violence used in the Council of *Ariminum* enough to invalidate all the acts of it. Lastly, *Facundus* [k] saith, *Never did any forced Council subscribe to any thing but Errour, as happened in those of* Ariminum *and* Ephesus.

[g] Κατὰ φιλονεικίαν καὶ βίαν συντιθέντα. Athan. Epist. ad Episc. Afric.

[h] Γενέσθω ἐκκλησιαστικὴ σύνοδος μακρὰν τῶν παλατίων ἐν ᾗ βασιλεὺς ἢ πάρεστιν, ἢ νόμος παραγίνεται, ἢ δικαστὴς ἀπειλεῖ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ φόβος ἀρκεῖ, καὶ ἃ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διάταξις. Id. Epist. ad Solit.

[i] Καὶ πάντα ἔχοντας μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἐν Ἀριμίνῳ πεπραγμένα, διὰ λύσιν τῶν κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐκεῖ γενομένων. Basil. Epist. 52. ad Athan.

[k] *Nusquam coactum concilium nisi fulsitati subscripsit; sicut in Arimino, &c.* Fac. lib. 12. cap. 3.

That a lawful Synod therefore ought to be free, is on all sides confessed. But we are not to imagin that this freedom is taken away only by Stripes, Imprisonment and the like. There are other more secret and no less efficacious means to obtain the same end. Among these *Canus* and *Richerius* reckon threats; St. *Ambrose*

Ambroſe the favour of Princes; when he ſaith [l] of the Fathers of *Ariminum*, *That ſeeking the favour of the Emperour, they loſt the favour of God, and deſiring to pleaſe great Men, ſubjected themſelves to a perpetual curſe.* Richerius [m] aſſerts this liberty is hindred *by force, threats, or other Factions and Plots, by immoderate making of Parties, favours, giving of Money or any other Gifts.* Card. *Perron* [n] ſaith, the deſire of pleaſing hath often crept in among Princes, and ſpoiled and corrupted the judgment of Synods. *Holden* [o] requireth that *all things be maturely diſcuſſed in the Synod without any begging of Votes, or ſollicitous making of Parties.* Laſtly *Eſtrix* [p] having ſaid, that the Biſhops of the II. *Epheſine* Council were forced by the violence of *Dioſcorus* to ſubſcribe to Hereſie, hath theſe words: But *you will ſay, this they did, compelled by Force and Terrour. True: but thoſe who can be compelled by Terrour to approve Hereſie; why may they not be induced to the ſame by other Reaſons, or any inordinate Deſire?*

[l] *Dum Imperatoris gratiam ſequuntur, Dei gratiam perdiderunt; qui cum placere potentibus aucupantur, maledictioſe perpetuo ſubdidere.* Ambr. in Luc. 6.

[m] *Vi aut minis, vel aliis ſtudiis aut fabricis, & prenſationibus immoderatis, vel gratiâ, pecuniâ aut pretio, vel rebus pecuniâ æſtimabilibus.* Rich. Apol. axiom. 22.

[n] Du Perron Repliq. liv. 1. chap. 28.

[o] *Abſque ſuffragiorum ambitu aut ſollicitâ prenſatione.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3.

[p] *Hæc illi, inquies, vi & terrore compulſi. Fateor: ſed qui terrore compelli potuerunt ad approbandam hæreſin, quidni potuiſſent delabi eodem aliis rationibus aut cupiditate pravâ impellente?* Eſtr. Diat. aſſert. 43.

From what hath been ſaid, I gather four things: I. That liberty in voting is a condition abſolutely neceſſary to a lawful and Infallible Council. II. That this liberty is infringed not only by open force, but alſo by threats, promiſes, gifts, ſolliciting of Votes, or any other ſecret Arts. III. That this may not only be, but hath actually been done, and that more than once. IV. That theſe things are ſo certain, that they are acknowledged by our Adverſaries, both Sorboniſts and Monarchiſts. But if theſe be true, as moſt certainly they are; we can never ſafely aſſent to the Decrees of a Council, till we be aſſured that no methods of Violence or Corruption, either manifeſt or ſecret, were uſed to infringe its liberty. But ſince none can know this but God alone, it is thence moſt evident, that we are not only not obliged to a blind aſſent to the Definitions of any Council, but that it would be a moſt groſs folly and manifeſt danger of Errour to do it: becauſe none but free Councils are Infallible; and no man can poſſibly know which are free.

Melchior Canus [q] ſaw this, who having produced the Example

[q] *Ita fiet, ut nullius Synodi explorata authoritas habeatur.* Can. loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 5.

of

of the II. *Ephesine* Synod adds, That *if a true and a lawful Synod can err through fear, then Heretiks may pretend that all the rest were subservient to the Lusts of Popes and Emperours; and so the Authority of no one Synod will be left certain.* Nor indeed is this fear of *Canus* vain. For long since many both Hereticks and Catholicks have complained of the violated liberty of Councils. So *Eusebius*, *Theognis* and *Maris*, repenting of their having subscribed in the Council of *Nice*, came to the Emperour; and told him, *We have done wickedly, O Emperour, in that being terrified by you we subscribed to Heresy*: As *Philostorgius* [r] relateth. So *Ibas* in his famous Epistle to *Maris* the *Persian* complaineth, the Fathers of the I. *Ephesine* Council were corrupted by *Cyrill*'s Gold. The Legates of the *Roman* See made the like complaint in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Lucentius* [s] telling the Presidents in open Council that the Bishops were circumvented, and forced to subscribe to Canons, to which they had not assented. In the V. Synod *Lupus* [t] saith that Justinian *became a* Diocletian, *and all the* Greek *Bishops were Servants to his inclinations*; and relateth the words of *Eustathius* the Presbyter, who affirms that nothing was therein done without violence, necessity, partiality, and affection. *Richerius* [u] saith, that *from the times of* Gregory VII. *to the Council of Constance for 340 years, the Popes were wont arbitrarily to impose Laws upon the Church; and having formed Canons and Definitions at home, to call Synods, and imperiously to propose them, where none dared so much as to mutter against them*: and in another place [x] tells us, That Gregory VII. *contrary to the custom used in the Church for more than a thousand years, introduced that order, that all Bishops should swear Obedience to the See of* Rome; *whence*, saith he, *the liberty of all subsequent Councils was taken away: but much more by the Popes arrogating to himself the collation of Ecclesiastical Dignities and Benefices: so that as long as his Government in the Church continueth, it seemeth altogether impossible to have a free Council.* *Duvall* [y] evinceth the Council of *Basil* was not free, from *Æneas Sylvius*, who relates that the *Eugenian* party being terrified with threats, all rose up together, and cried out in the Council, "*Liberty, Liberty is taken away from us. How is it that the Patriarch threatens he will break our heads?* The *Greeks* returning home protested against the force put upon them in the Council of *Florence*, and therefore would not stand to the Decrees of it. As for the Council of *Trent*, *Richerius*

[r] *Apud Nicetam*, Thes. lib. 5. cap. 8.

[s] Concil. Chalced. Act. 16.

[t] *In hâc Synodo Justinianus Diocletianum induerat; ejus affectibus serviebant omnes Græcorum Episcopi.* Lup. tom. 1. p. 737.

[u] *Ita ut vix ullus contra mussare auderet: quæ forma Conciliorum habendorum viguit à seculo Gregorii VII. ad tempora Synodi Constantiensis.* Rich. Apol. ax. 38.

[x] Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 13. *Ita ut hoc stante regimine omnino impossibile videatur liberum haberi Concilium.*

[y] Duvall. Anteloq. ad lib. de potest. Pont.

rius

rius [1] assures us, That the *Essential Liberty of Councils (which giveth to the Bishops full power of proposing what they please) was wholly taken away; while none were permitted to propose any thing but the Popes Legates, upon pretext indeed of avoiding confusion, but really that all occasion of disputing freely concerning the necessity of reforming the Church both in Head and Members might be taken away from the Fathers of the Council. And these are the fine arts, wherewith the Court of* Rome *upholds her absolute Monarchy or rather Tyranny. That in modern Councils Bishops are not Judges and Legislators, as they ought to be, but only Counsellors to the Pope, and cannot freely give their Suffrages in the Council; because the Infallible Power and absolute Will of the Pope, must now adayes be received and observed instead of all Synod, Deliberation, Consent, Law, Canon, and Communion of Saints: whereby the Church is become the Bondslave of the Pope, as* Cajetan [2] *impiously and flatteringly calls her.* But the intolerable oppression of Liberty and various Arts used in the Council of *Trent*, F. *Paul* amply relates in his History of that Council. You will say, perhaps, these are false, and calumnies. But how doth this appear? Other Historians perhaps deliver contrary accounts. But how shall we be ascertained they tell truth? If the first Historians be disbelieved; why may not these also? How ever it be, possible it is the first relation may be true; and until they be proved false, we can never be certain they are not true, can never esteem those Councils free, and consequently not Infallible. For that the irregularity of a Council is not manifest, sufficeth not to found our Faith upon its Decrees; but to that end the perfect regularity of it must be known and evident: which cannot be, while the freedom of it is uncertain.

[1] *Colore quidem impediendæ confusionis, sed revera ut omnis occasio liberius disputandi de necessitate Ecclesiæ reformandæ in Capite & in membris patribus Concilii tolleretur. Et hæ sunt artes eximiæ; quibus Curia* Romana *suam absolutam fulcit Monarchiam, ne dicam tyrannidem.* Rich. Apol. ax. 22. *& in* Epilogo. *Si hodie celebrentur Concilia, Episcopi non sunt Judices, &c. Item liberam sententiæ dictionem non habent in Synodis, quoniam potestas infallibilis & voluntas absoluta Papæ pro omni Synodo, deliberatione, consensu, lege, Canone, & communione Sanctorum coli servarique debet, ex quo etiam, &c.*

[2] Apolop. part. 1. cap. 1.

But this is not all, *Canus* and *Estrix* before truly observed, That herein no more account is to be had of *Fear*, than of any other perturbation of the mind: and that he who can be forced by threats to decree against his Conscience, may no less vehemently be shaken and drawn from the truth by Hatred, Anger, Hope, Desire, or the like. Certainly the efficacy of these Passions is no whit less; and if the H. Ghost defends not Bishops in Council from the impressions of Fear, neither will he from the temptations of other Affections. Suppose therefore we be assured no force was used to infringe

infringe the Liberty of the Council, which we can never be; yet this will not suffice, unless we be at the same time ascertained that the Bishops were corrupted with no Passions, led by no Affections, and served no Interest in giving their Suffrages. Till then we must suspend our assent to the Decrees of any Council; as justly doubting, whether that may not have undergone the same unhappiness, which hath attended some former Councils. So *Lupus* accuseth the Fathers of the I. *Constantinopolitan* Council of envy against the *Western* Bishops, but especially the Church of *Rome*. *Liberatus* relates, That *Theodorus Ascidas*, Favourite to the Emperour *Justinian*, in revenge of the Condemnation of his admired *Origen*, projected the design of the V. Council, and thereby extorted from the whole World the Condemnation of the *Tria Capitula*. *Duval*, That the Council of *Basil* was blinded with hatred against Pope *Eugenius*. What happened to these, might as well to other Councils, and who can assure us it did not?

But no Liberty seemeth more requisite to the establishment of Truth; than that which purgeth the Mind from preconceived Opinions, and addicts it wholly to Truth. For it cannot be hoped, that they who are infected with Errour, should define rightly; and immediately upon their entring the Council, from Patrons of Heresie become Champions of Faith. This Experience hath often taught. For why did the Councils of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*; and *Chalcedon* define rightly, but because they consisted of Orthodox Bishops? Why the *African* under *Cyprian*, and all the *Arrian* Councils erroneously; but because they were made up of Bishops favouring those Errours? Why the Council of *Sardica* both rightly and erroneously, well at *Sardica*, ill at *Philippopolis*; but because the Orthodox Bishops stay'd at *Sardica*, the Heretical went to *Philippopolis*? How comes it to pass therefore, that in assigning so many conditions of an Infallible Council, this one should be forgotten, the most necessary of all, that it consist only of Orthodox Bishops? Wisely then did the Popes, *Leo* and *Vigilius*, who laboured hard, that only an equal number of *Greeks* and *Latins* might be admitted into the IV. and V. Councils, the one fearing the *Eutychians*, the other the Enemies of the *Tria Capitula*. However it be, if Threats and Promises, if Fear and Desire can hinder Orthodox Bishops from defining truly; much more will preconceived Opinions hinder Heretical ones from decreeing rightly: Since the first are drawn to favour Errour unwillingly, and act in it coldly; the latter promote it with their utmost Zeal and greatest Vigour.

Lastly,

Laſtly, I do not ſee, how if a Council be placed beyond all danger of erring by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, Fear, or any other Paſſions can ſo far prevail in it, as to divert the Fathers of it from the right way. This might indeed be, if Councils were infallible in their Nature, but in their Hypotheſis, who aſcribe their Infallibility only to the external direction of the Holy Spirit, it is highly abſurd and irrational. For cannot the Holy Ghoſt invincibly arm the minds of thoſe, in whom he dwells, againſt the terrors of Threats or Temptations of deſire? Why then is the Hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, ſung before every Seſſion of Councils? Why is it expreſly ſaid, *Accende lumen ſenſibus; Infunde amorem cordibus; Infirma noſtri corporis virtute firmans perpeti?* Why is he called the Living Fountain, Fire, Charity, and Spiritual Unction? Why the finger of Gods Right Hand, but to deſign his powerful Aſſiſtance againſt all the defects of Nature, and infirmities of Mind? This aſſiſtance therefore is deſired. If it be obtained, in vain are Threats, Bribes, Promiſes, and other Frauds: they can never corrupt the Council. If it be not, who can aſſure us the other part of the Petition is granted, *viz.* Illumination of Mind to diſcern and diſpel the Sophiſtry of Hereticks. But why do I inſiſt on this? If we conſider thoſe Holy Men, in whom the Holy Ghoſt is thought to have dwelt, and armed with his Graces for the defence of Truth, as *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtin*, and the reſt; we ſhall find that they were impenetrable to fear or flattery, and conſtantly deſpiſed both the threats and promiſes of *Arian* Princes. If the Holy Ghoſt therefore preſides over Councils, neither the force nor fraud of Enemies can obſtruct the Infallibility of it; and we may much more juſtly and truly, than *Richerius* did before, apply thoſe words of St. *Paul* to them, *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty.* For he alledged them to prove that Liberty is a Condition pre-required to the preſence of the Holy Ghoſt in a Council: whereas the conſtruction of them manifeſts it to be rather an effect of this preſence: according to that of our Saviour: [2] *If the Son ſhall make you free, ye ſhall be free indeed:* and [3] *the Truth ſhall make you free.* For the Holy Ghoſt is the Spirit of Chriſt; ſo that what is done by the one, may be well attributed to the other. But to make an end. Our Adverſaries found the Infallibility of Councils upon the promiſes of the

[2] John VIII. 36.

[3] *Ibid.* v. 32.

aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt made to the Apoſtles by our Saviour in thoſe words, *The Spirit of Truth ſhall guide you into all truth*; *I will ſend another Comforter*, &c. which they maintain to have been ſpoken not only to the Apoſtles, but to their Succeſſors alſo to the Worlds end. If ſo, then muſt neceſſarily be conferred on both an Infallibility of the ſame kind and quality. But were the Apoſtles preſerved by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt from involuntary Errors, and left unarmed to the aſſaults of Threats and Promiſes? Certainly no. Chriſt both promiſed and gave to them his aſſiſtance againſt all kind of Temptations and Corruptions, whereby they might be drawn to betray the Truth. Either Councils therefore have the ſame aſſiſtance, or can pretend no ſhare in theſe Promiſes.

Two ſeveral ways therefore is the Authority of Councils overthrown by the Doctrine and Conceſſions of our Adverſaries about the neceſſity of their Liberty; both in that it is certain they may be drawn from Truth by any other means as well as defect of Liberty, and uncertain whether there was ever any free Councils. The *Sorboniſts* can oppoſe nothing to this: but the *Monarchiſts* think they can. They pretend that when a Council is thus corrupted, yet the Rock of the Church, the Pope, remains unſhaken, whom no force can move, as for whom Chriſt prayed, that his Faith ſhould never fail. For firſt, the *Sorboniſts* deny this; which ſufficeth for me, as proving that pretended Privilege of the Pope not to be of Faith, and ſo not able to give certainty to the Decrees of a Council, whoſe Liberty is ſuſpected. But then this invincible Conſtancy of the Pope is demonſtrated to be falſe by the Examples of *Marcellinus*, *Liberius*, *Paſchal* II. and *Eugenius* IV. to which we may add a fifth, that of Pope *Vigilius*, from whom the Emperour *Juſtinian*, after he had extorted by force and threats the Condemnation of the *Tria Capitula* from the fifth Council, extorted an Approbation of the Council's Decree by the ſame Method: as he did afterwards in like manner from his Succeſſor *Pelagius*. *Lupus* [4] acknowledgeth both, ſaying, that *Vigilius*, *overcome with hardſhips, and the deſire of recovering*

[4] *Vigilius erumnis laſſus & libertatis ac ſedis recuperanda amore victus, tandem conſenſit in Synodum. — Pelagius Romani Epiſcopatûs amore ad recipiendam Synodum eſt inflexus.* Lup. in Concil. Tom. 1. p. 737.

his

his Liberty and See; and *Pelagius*, *corrupted with desire of the Papal Chair*, both consented and approved the Synod. Popes therefore as well as Councils may be drawn to decree against their Consciences. No where is to be found invincible Constancy; no where the desired Certainty.

CHAP. XVI.

That it cannot be known, whether the Intention of the Fathers of the Council be right.

AS Lawfulness and Liberty are necessary to the constitution of an Infallible Council; so is a right proceeding in it, when constituted. This consists in three things; a good Intention, an accurate Examination of the Question to be defined, and a Canonical Conclusion. Every one of these beget new scruples and perplexities; of which in their Order. First therefore it is required, that the Bishops, laying aside all Worldly Interests, seek only the finding out of Truth, the Glory of God, and Edification of the Church. For they cannot define Truth, unless they know it: Know it they cannot, but either wholly by their own Sagacity and Industry, or by the Assistance and Illumination of the Holy Ghost. The first way must be and is acknowledged to be fallible by our Adversaries, who therefore fly to the second, and impute all the certainty of Conciliar definitions to the direction of the Holy Ghost. Hence the Mass of the Holy Ghost, and the Hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*, is wont to precede every Session of Councils; and this Title prefixed to their Decrees, *The Holy Universal Synod Lawfully Assembled in the Holy Ghost*; and oftentimes that other, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*; which supposeth the Council to be directed and assisted by the Holy Ghost.

But can we imagine that Holy Spirit illuminates their Minds, whose Hearts he doth not sanctifie, and inflame with love of

Truth and zeal of Divine Glory? He inspireth not Souls defiled with Sin, and addicted to worldly Considerations. So the Author of the Book of Wisdom: [1] *For into a malicious Soul Wisdom shall not enter; nor dwell in the Body that is subject unto sin. For the Holy Spirit of Discipline will flee Deceit, and remove from Thoughts that are without Understanding, and will not abide when unrighteousness cometh in.*--- Our Saviour promiseth the knowledge of his Truth only to those, who by Piety and the Love of Heavenly things, have fitted their Minds for the reception of it. So he tells the believing *Jews*, [2] *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my Disciples indeed.* And *ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.* And in another place, [3] *He that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and manifest my self to him.* The like saith *David*, [4] *The meek will he guide in judgment; and the meek will he teach his way.* And a little after, *The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew them his Covenant.* And St. *Paul* speaking of them that received not the love of Truth, that they might be saved, saith, [5] *And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lye.* And in another place [6] asserteth, that *some having put away a good Conscience, made shipwrack in the Faith.*

[1] Sap. I. 4, 5.
[2] John VIII. 31, 32.
[3] John XIV. 21.
[4] Psal. XXV.
[5] 2 Thes. II. 11.
[6] 1 Tim. I. 19.

These places cannot be eluded by saying, they speak of a Practical and not a Speculative Knowledge of the Truth. For besides that this can by no means be apply'd to the two last places, I cannot see with what appearance of reason God can be said to promise Knowledge of Truth to those that love him, fear him; and to the meek, who by being such, must be supposed to have had it before. A Theoretical therefore, or more clear and distinct knowledge of the Truth is to be understood to be here promised to Vertuous and sincerely Pious Persons. Whence it cannot be supposed the same by the ordinary Law of Divine Government is granted to prophane and wicked Bishops in a Council, if there be any such, as none denieth such may be. This St. *Chrysostom* asserts, when upon those words, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*; he saith, [7] *What then? are not two or three gathered together*

[7] Τί οὖν; οὐκ εἰσὶ δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνεγμένοι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, εἰσὶ μὲν, σπανίως δὲ οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς τὴν σύνοδον λέγει, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐπιστητεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ μάλιστα μὲν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν μετὰ τούτου, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ μετὰ πολλῆς ἀπαιτεῖ τῆς ἀκριβείας. Chrysost. in Matth. Homil. 60.

ther in his name? Yes, but very rarely. For he doth not only mention a Meeting (a Synod) or require that alone, but together with that requireth others Vertues, and that with great exactness, and in the first place. Nicholas de Clemangis [8] proveth the same thing largely and accurately. He affirms, the first four Councils were for no other reason had in so great Honour, than because they consisted of holy and pious Men; and denieth that wicked Men are directed by the Holy Ghost. *For how should he hear, visit, or illustrate them, who resist him, and endeavour to extinguish him in others, when they cannot in themselves, who instead of the fire of Charity are enflamed with the heat of Ambition?* He observeth also, That the Fathers of Ancient Councils used to begin their Sessions with Fastings, Prayers, and Tears; *Which would have been unnecessary, saith he, if they had been certain they could not err, nor be deceived in their Undertakings, nor be defrauded of their desire for want of due preparation and disposition.*

[8] *Illos quomodo audiat aut visitet, aut illustret, qui sibi adversantur, illumque cum in se non possint, in aliis extinguere nituntur, qui pro igne charitatis ardere sunt ambitionis inflammati?* Clem. in disp. cum Schol. par.

The Presidents of the Council of *Trent* were perswaded of the truth of this. For in the beginning of the Council they penned an Admonition, which they commanded frequently to be read, wherein they exhorted the Fathers to be touched with a true and lively sense of the Sins that occasioned so many Evils; [9] that *otherwise in vain was the Council celebrated, in vain the Holy Ghost invocated:* For that he, how greatly soever intreated, would not be present: That Repentance and Reformation of Life was absolutely necessary to obtain the assistance of that Holy Spirit, who had formerly refused to give any Answer to the *Jews* consulting him in the Prophet *Ezekiel*, because of their Abominations; that they must necessarily abstain from those things which are wont to corrupt the love of Truth, and deprave the Judgment; as all Passions and perturbations of the Mind, Anger, Hatred, Favour, or the like. *For these are the things which grieve and drive away the Holy Ghost, whom we have invoked; without whom we can do nothing that may tend to the good and peace of the Church.* Hence may be noted the shameless folly of Cardinal *Palavicini*'s pretence, who would make his Readers believe, That the Presidents by all this meant no more, than that Repentance and amendment of Life was necessary, not to defining rightly, but to the successful execution of their Definitions, and happy extirpation of Heresy. Consonantly to the Admonition of

[9] *Nisi hæc bene cognita & perspecta fuerint, frustra intramus in concilium, frustra invocamus Spiritum Sanctum, &c. Hæc sunt quæ contristant & repellunt quem invocavimus Sp. S. sine quo nihil omnino facere poterimus, quod ad bonum & pacem Ecclesiæ cedat.*

of the Presidents, *Didacus Payva Andradius*, who was present in the Council, teacheth, [10] That *those only may be said to meet in the name of Christ, whom not any private interests, not Ambition, Hatred, Envy, or the like; but Charity, and the love of Peace, Truth, and Piety actuates and enflames. For they who meet to serve their own Interest or Party, or to deceive Mankind with the specious name of a Council; meet not in the name of Christ, nor are to be called Ecclesiastical, but pestilent Assemblies.* Lastly, *Duval* [11] absolutely requireth that the Bishops act in the Council, *Laying aside all Humane Affections, and proposing to themselves only the finding out of Truth.* And in another place, *That no fraud, force, or injury be offered to any, that none of those present be prepossessed with any Passion or Commotion of Mind, but that all be led with the love of Truth.*

[10] *Ii verò in Christi nomine congregari dicuntur, quos non privata commoda inducunt, non honoris aura, &c. Nam qui ut privatis rationibus consulant, contentionibus serviant, miserosque homines speciosò Concilii nomine decipiant, coeunt; minime quidem in Christi nomine convenire, nec Ecclesiasticos sed mortiferos conventus agitare dicendi sunt.* Andr. def. Concil. Trid. Lib. 1.

[11] *Sepositis humanis affectibus, & solâ sibi propositâ veritate.* Duval de potest. pont. part. 4. qu. 6. *Ubi nemini fit fraus, vis, aut injuria, nullusque adstantium animi motu aut passione praepeditur, sed omnes veritatis amore ducuntur.* Id. qu. 20.

It is manifest therefore both from Reason and the Confession of our Adversaries, That Truth cannot infallibly be defined in a Council, unless the Bishops bring with them Minds truly desirous of it, and animated with Zeal for the Honour of God; and moreover, cordially implore the Divine Assistance. But since this escapeth the knowledge of Man, and is perceived by God alone, the searcher of Hearts; whatsoever depends upon so dubious and obscure a condition, must necessarily be uncertain. For who can certainly tell, whether all the Bishops of any Council were prepared and disposed, and that nothing was indulged therein to Flesh and Blood? Neither can you say, that this is indeed necessary, but never deficient; that God takes care by his Providence the Bishops be rightly dispos'd, and fully perform their duty. For first, God hath no where promised this; and then Experience hath proved the contrary. This vigilant care of God had no place in the 2*d. Ephesine* Council, none in the two *Constantinopolitan* Synods against Images under *Leo Isaurus* and *Constantine Copronimus*, if our Adversaries speak true; none in the Council of *Basil*, where the Bishops were blinded with hatred against *Eugenius*, if we believe the partizans of the Court of *Rome*, who are wont abundantly to vilifie all Councils, that decreed contrary to their liking. But

But they are neither the first nor the only Persons, that have complained of these abuses. All know what *Gregory Nazianzen* [12] writes of the Fathers of the I. Council of *Constantinople*; whom he calls *a tumultuous Rabble, a factious Assembly*, composed of ignorant and vile fellows newly taken from the Plough, the Oar, the Army, and the Chain, of the posterity of the Collectors, who thought of nothing but falsifying their accounts, of mean Mechanicks newly started out of their shops, some of them *meer Rascals and fitter to be placed in Houses of Correction*. Yet this is the second of the four most ancient and most famous Councils; which *Gregory* l. and with him many others profess to reverence equally with the four Gospels. These irregularities made *Nazianzen* resolve never to be present in any more Synods, [13] *where nothing but Strife, Contentions, and exposing of one anothers faults, and thence mortal hatred on each side were to be observed*. *Isidore Peleusiota* [14] writes to *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, President of the first *Ephesine* Synod, that many of those, who were present in *Ephesus* accused him, *that seeking the Revenge of a private injury, he did not Orthodoxly enquire after the things of Christ*. And in another place he exhorts him *to leave off contention, and not take revenge of the Church for his private injuries, and sow eternal Discord under pretext of Piety*. Of *Pelagius Legate*, afterwards Pope of *Rome*, and *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, whereof one procured *Origen*, the other *Theodorus of Mopsuestia* to be condemned, and so occasioned the fifth Synod, *Liberatus* [15] saith, *it is manifest that by those two this scandal entred into the Church, which* Theodorus *also publickly Confessed, crying out that he and* Pelagius *deserved to be burned alive for introducing that scandal*. And *Garnerius* [16] in his notes upon that place, confesseth *the thing was undertaken with a furious partiality, and incredibly imbittered minds*. Not to say that *Lupus* in a passage above cited makes *Justinian* in this whole business a Partizan of *Theodorus*, and all the *Greek* Bishops Slaves to him. Lastly an Eminent Writer, *Claudius Sainctes*, [17] who

[12] Naz. *Quarel. de Episcopis & hominum ingratitudine. Flagrionesque & pistrinis digni.*

[13] Ἐνθ' ἔρις, ἔνθα μάθοις τι κὴ ἄλλο κενεαὶ πάθεσιν
Εἰς ἓν δυσμενίαν χῶσιν ἀγιεύμενα.
Naz. Carm. X. *de diverf. vita gener.*

[14] Isid. *Epist.* 310.

[15] *Illud liquere omnibus credo per* Pelagium, *&c. hoc scandalum in Ecclesiam fuisse ingressum; quod etiam publicè ipse* Theodorus *clamitavit se &* Pelagium, *vivos incendendos, per quos hoc scandalum intravit in mundum.* Liberat. Brev. cap. ult.

[16] *Etsi negotium hoc vesano partium studio, infensisque incredibiliter animis susceptum est.*

[17] *Nusquam præsentiori numine afflatus est, quàm cùm venire isthuc noluisti. Nullus enim dubito, quin præ dolore mortuum esses, si ea vidisses, quæ ad eludendam reformationem infanda patrantur.* Cl. Sanct. epist. ad Espenc.

went

went with the other *French Divines* to the Council of *Trent*, relates what he observed there in these words, speaking to *Espencæus*. *Never were you more plainly inspired by God, than when you refused to come hither. For I doubt not, but you would have died with grief, if you had seen those wicked Arts, which are put in practice to elude a Reformation.*

If any one shall suspect the like of any other Council, he will have no mean Authors for his Leaders in it. However that the Fathers of any Council were better inclined, must appear to us otherwise than from the Universality of it; since Learned Men have long since observed, that many in *Oecumenical* Councils have fought any thing rather than the Glory of God. Yet is that the only way, that is or can be offered for our assurance therein.

CHAP. XVII.

That it seldom appears, whether a sufficient Inquiry hath preceded the Decrees of a Council.

THe second part of a lawful proceeding in the Council, is a diligent Inquiry and Examination of the Question to be defined. For truth is not now obtained by immediate Revelation, or Extatick Inspiration, but by a Labour and Diligence proportionate to the difficulty of the thing it self. The Bishop of a Council must carefully enquire into the Truth, patiently hear both Parties, maturely weigh the Arguments on both sides, accurately compare them with the invariable Rule of Faith, and then only when they are conscious to themselves they have omitted no part of requisite diligence, to pronounce sentence. This is the constant Opinion of our Adversaries as well as ours. *Melchior Canus* [1] teacheth, that in *Councils the Fathers ought not immediately by their Athority to*

[1] *In Conciliis non debent Patres mox quasi ex authoritate sententiam abs-que aliâ discussione dicere; sed collationibus & disputationibus re antè tractatâ, precibusque primùm ad Deum fusis, tum verò quæstio à Concilio sine errore finietur; Dei sc. auxilio atque favore, hominumque diligentiâ & studio conspirantibus.—Ex quo perspicuum est non dormientibus & ascitantibus Patribus Spiritum Sanctum assistere, sed diligenter humanâ viâ & ratione quærentibus rei de quâ disseritur veritatem---quamobrem qui sive Pontificum sive Conciliorum diligentiam in fidei causâ finendâ in dubium vocant, eos necesse est Pontificum judicia ac Conciliorum infirmare.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 5.

give

give Sentence; but the Matter must be first weighed in conferences, and Prayers offered up to God; then shall the Question be determined by the Council without Errour, the assistance and favour of God, the diligence and study of Men conspiring together. And then from the Examples of the Councils of Hierusalem *and* Nice concludeth, *It is manifest that the Holy Ghost assists not the Fathers when idle and careless, but diligently seeking out the truth of the Question proposed, by human means and ways; wherefore they which call in doubt the diligence of Popes or Councils in defining a matter of Faith, must necessarily invalidate the Decrees of Popes and Councils.* The same saith *Ferus* in Act. XV. 7. *Bellarmin de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 7.* Duvall Anteloq. ad lib. de potest. Pont. & part. 2. qu. 4. *Cellotius de Hierarchiâ* lib. 4 cap. 10. *Bagotius* Instit. Theol. lib. 4. disp. 5. cap. 4. sect. 1. *Maimbourg de la vraye Eglise* cap. 10. sect. 4. & 9. *Martinonus de fide disp.* 9. sect. 7. whole words would be too long to cite at large. The *Sorbonists* maintain the same thing. So *Richerius:* [2] *The Church cannot err in deciding Questions of Right; if she useth necessary diligence, and acts prudently, as the African Fathers say in their Epistle to Pope* Cœlestin. Holden [3]: *In an infallible Synod all things ought to be done conciliarly (as* Divines *speak) so as the matter in hand be discussed with a diligent and faithful examination, without any making of parties or soliciting of votes.*

[2] *Ecclesia errare non potest in quæstionibus juris decidendis; si modò diligentiam necessariam adhibeat & prudenter agat: ut Patres Africani loquuntur.* Rich. Apol. ax. 23.

[3] *Debent omnia in hujusmodi Synodo conciliariter (ut loquuntur Theologi) peragi; ita ut prævio examine diligenti & fideli absque suffragiorum ambitu aut sollicitâ prensatione discutiatur subjecta materia.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3.

If these Divines be in the right, as they certainly are; then what certainty can be in the Decrees of Councils? Who shall assure us, that the Bishops did all they ought to do? and how shall every private Man know that? *Canus* was not ignorant of this. *If once,* saith he, [4] *we give Heretick leave to call in question the requisite diligence of the Judges of the Church; who doth not see, that all the Decrees of Popes and Councils are presently overthrown?* He therefore takes Refuge in the Providence of God, and pretends that God, in promising Infallibility to his Church, must be supposed to have obliged himself thereby, to take care, that necessary diligence, which is the means of it, should never be wanting in the Judges of the Church. Hence, saith he,

[4] *Si semel hæreticis hanc licentiam permittimus, ut in quæstionem vocent, &c. quis adeò cæcus est ut non videat omnia mox Pontificum Conciliorumque decreta labefactari? --Itaque præstat semper Pontifex quod in se est, præstatque Concilium, cum de fide pronunciant; caditque causa, si quis è nostris aliter existimat.* Can. ubi supra.

the Pope always performs his Duty, the Council their duty, when they pronounce of Faith; and if any of our Divines think otherwise, our cause is ruined.

In this Argument of *Canus* I observe first, that he confounds the Means with the Conditions. Diligence is a Condition, which God imposeth upon the finding out Truth. If the Council neglects this, God is bound to no promise: the Error is to be imputed wholly to them. Secondly, if the Council can neglect no Conditions, no diligence necessary to defining rightly, and always punctually perform their duty; it is impossible it should ever err. For the Divine Assistance will never be wanting to humane industry in Matters of Faith; and when both meet, there can be no Errour. Thirdly, if Councils therefore perform their duty, because God in promising to them Infallibility, the end, must be supposed also to promise the means, whereof this is one: Then every Council is infallible, none ought to be rejected, all are indifferently to be received; because God must be believed to have promised his Assistance to all Councils, not wanting in their Duty, and also to take care that none should be wanting in it. You will say perhaps *Canus* understands not all, but only Lawful Councils. But I would know what are those Lawful Councils. For Councils are such three ways, upon account of their Indiction, Constitution, and Proceeding. If you answer by the two first ways, then the thing is false. For the second Council of *Ephesus*, by the Confession of *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, was both rightly called an dconstituted, yet degenerated and proceeded inordinately. If he means the third way; then his answer will come to no more than this, That Councils will proceed rightly, if they proceed rightly.

But to put an end to this pretence; none will deny, that the Council of *Constance* was lawful: Yet *Canus* confesseth, that necessary diligence was not always used in it. *Some things*, saith he, [s] *were not acted conciliarly, for in the* IV. *and* V. *Sessions no Disputation or Disquisition preceded; no Learned Men were chosen to dispute and treat of those things that were to be defined in Faith.* The same thing is acknowledged by *Richerius* of the great Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* III. wherein *Transubstantiation* and the Deposition of Heretical Princes were decreed.

[s] *Quædam non conciliariter acta. Nam in* IV. *&* V. *sessione nec disputatio aut disquisitio aliqua intercesserat nec delecti fuerant adhuc viri docti ad differendum & tractandum ea quæ in fidei doctrinâ essent constituenda.* Id. lib. 5. cap. ult.

We

We learn, saith he, [6] *out of* Matthew Paris, *that nothing was acted conciliarly in that Council after the manner of other Councils, the common Votes and Suffrages of the Fathers not being singly discussed, weighed, and collected. When therefore 'tis one thing only to read a few Articles in a Council* (and so shuffle them up, for no more was done) *another thing to examine and decree them Synodically and Canonically, using due diligence. In vain doth* Bellarmin *labour to palliate the Business.* So *Maimbourg* [7] observeth that the Ancient Councils were far more diligent than the Modern; and for an example of this degeneracy brings this very Council of *Lateran*; wherein the weightiest Matters of Faith, Manners, and Discipline were defined, and (which took up most of their time) Peace and War treated of; and all concluded in three weeks. The same Author in another place [8] wonders how the Council of *Lyons* under *Innocent* IV. wherein many things, the least whereof would require a long and tedious discussion, were decreed, could be finished in three Sessions. But neither in Elder times was due diligence always observed. Whosoever shall read the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, will easily perceive how hastily they were made. *Hosius* propounded what he thought fit. He asked the Bishops whether it pleased them. They cried out, It did; nothing more was done: his Propositions immediately became Canons. So in the Council of *Chalcedon* in one Session, or rather end of a Session, when the *Pope's Legates* and *Emperour's Commissioners* were gone out, thinking the Session was ended, suddenly XXVIII Canons were clapt up; whereof every one deserved a long Consideration.

[6] *Ex Matthæo Par. discimus nihil quicquam actum in illa Synodo conciliariter ex more aliorum Conciliorum, nimirum communibus votis atque suffragiis Patrum sigillatim discussis, perpensis & collectis——— Cùm ergò aliud sit aliquarecitare capitula in Concilio, aliud, &c.* Rich. Apol. ax. 38.

[7] Maimb. *de bello sacro lib.* 11. *ad an.* 1215.

[8] *Ibid. ad an.* 1245.

Neither can you say that greater care and diligence is wont to be used in defining Matters of Faith. Here also it is often wanting. For where should we rather expect to find it, than in weighing the Arguments on both sides, consulting the rule of Faith, and searching out the sence of Scripture? yet nothing is more frequent in the Decrees of Councils, than to find trifling Reasons, false Glosses upon Scripture, and impertinent Allegations. Upon such sandy and weak Foundations are their Definitions often built. *Canus*, *Bellarmin*, *Valentia*, and many

others confeſs this. I will produce now only *Holden* and *Duvall*. *Holden* [9] ſaith, that the Prefaces, Reaſons, Arguments, and Illuſtrations of conciliar Decrees *have not the virtue of a definition*. Duvall: [10] *We confidently aſſert, that the greateſt part of the Acts* (of Councils) *pertain not to Faith: alſo the Reaſons which the Fathers rely upon in decreeing their Concluſions.* To prove this, he brings the Example of the VII. Synod; which defined Angels might be painted, becauſe they are corporeal; and of the Synod of *Eliberis*, which forbad Candles to be lighted in Church-yards, leſt the Souls of the Dead ſhould be diſturbed. To theſe he might have added many more Examples, and particularly out of the II. Council of *Nice*; where for the ſake of Images, Scripture, Fathers, and Logick are moſt ſhamefully abuſed; ſo as may create Indignation and Laughter together. Now I ask, whether thoſe can be ſaid to have examined the matter in hand diligently, uſed the Rule of Faith rightly, and conſidered the Arguments of both ſides maturely; who obtrude ſuch impertinent trifles for ſolid foundations of their Decrees? Nay, even in the Council of *Trent*, where they diſputed ſo ſharply and copiouſly, too much haſt was ſometimes made in their proceedings. Certainly when they decreed the vulgar verſion to be authentick; in whatſoever ſence that be underſtood, they muſt have decided an infinite number of things at the ſame time. For thereby the *Synod* pronounced there was no verſe in it which was not the pure Word of God, at leaſt contained nothing falſe. How great and how accurate an Examination did this require? Yet none at all uſed, the Verſion not ſo much as read before them; but the thing defined, as if it were ſelf-evident. Raſhly therefore; and if raſhly, why not falſly? In a word, this condition is neither always fulfilled; nor can it be known, but by a very few, when it is ſo.

From what hath been ſaid, appeareth how raſhly and untruly *Canus* affirmed neceſſary diligence to be never wanting to Councils. *Richerius* therefore having related our Objection and the Anſwer of *Canus*, pronounceth thus. [11] *By this means he ſolves not the difficulty, but rather*

[9] *Nequaquam habent virtutem definitionis.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3.

[10] *Audaciter aſſerimus maximam partem aliorum ad fidem non pertinere. — Item rationes quibus Patres in decernendis concluſionibus nituntur.* Duval. Anteloq.

[11] *Sic difficultatem non ſolvit, ſed potius involvit atque incruſtat, ut ſæpè ſolet.* Rich. Hiſt. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 9.

rather involveth it, and dawbs it over, as he is wont to do. He promiſeth a better ſolution, and having cited a paſſage of *Peter de Alliaco*, wherein he ſaith, that Infallibility is only a Privilege of the Univerſal Church, that it may be piouſly believed Councils do not err if they be guided by Scripture, otherwiſe they have erred, anſwers, [12] That *in this caſe a moral and probable conjecture, ſuch as wiſe men make uſe of in actions of Life, is ſufficient; and when it is manifeſt that the Council be free, and the Fathers have uſed neceſſary diligence, we muſt acquieſce in their Decrees, unleſs they be clearly repugnant to Faith.* How near to truth doth the good Doctor approach? For firſt, he rejects not the Opinion of the Cardinal; which if admitted, will ſoon put an end to the Controverſie. Secondly, by the laſt clauſe of his Anſwer he confeſſeth that a Council free, and uſing requiſite diligence, may pronounce contrary to the Faith. Otherwiſe the exception would be vain, if the Caſe could never happen. Laſtly, when he flieth to a probable conjecture, he doth thereby plainly acknowledge, that certainty cannot be had; which ſufficeth for me. For if our Adverſaries confeſs they want certainty, I ſhall not envy them their probability.

[12] *Cenſeo hic moralem & probabilem conjecturam, qualem rebus agendis ſapientes impendere conſueverunt, ſufficere; atque ubi conſtat Concilium fuiſſe liberum, & Patres diligentiam adhibuiſſe neceſſariam, planè acquieſcendum eſſe, niſi forte aperte conſtaret aliquid contra fidem eſſe patratum.* Id. Ibid.

CHAP. XVIII.

That it is uncertain, whether plurality of Suffrages ought to overcome, or whether perfect unanimity be required. That in both Caſes no ſmall Difficulties occurr.

THere remains the laſt part of a Lawful Proceeding, the Concluſion; whereby the Preſident of the Council, when he hath heard the Suffrages of the Fathers, ſolemnly pronounceth Sentence. Concerning this is no ſmall Controverſie, *viz.* Whether the Preſident of the Council, whoſoever he be, ought to give Sentence according to the major part of the Suffrages; or whether a full or abſolute unanimity be neceſſary; and whether the ſame account is to be made of a Decree made by the Votes of all, and by the Votes of the major part. The *Monarchiſts*

narchists distinguish here, and say, that if the Pope himself presideth, and perceives either the major part or all to favour Error, he may deny his assent to them, and give Sentence as himself pleaseth. But if only the Legates preside, and have Instructions what to do; if the major number of Votes be consonant to their Instructions, they may give Sentence without expecting unanimity; if repugnant, they must suspend their assent on both sides, and refer all to the Pope, who may determine it as he pleaseth. However regularly and ordinarily they think plurality of Votes ought to overcome. So *Bellarmin*: [1] *That Decree of a Council is true, which is made by the major part; otherwise no Decree of a Council would be lawful, since some have dissented in all.* And in another place [2] produceth the Example of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which declared Hereticks ten *Ægyptian* Bishops, who would not acquiesce in the Judgment of the major part: And in a third place saith, [3] *There will never be an end of Controversies, unless we give place to the major part of Suffrages.* The same saith *Tho. Bosius* [4], and many others. This Opinion seemeth also to have obtained at *Trent*. For when the Fathers were divided about abolishing Clandestine Marriages, 56 Bishops against the Decree, 133 for it, and both parties obstinate, they agreed to consult the Pope; who gave Sentence for the Decree: and *his Approbation*, saith Card. *Palavicini* [5], *took away all doubt.* Yet this was not always done. For although 30 Bishops, and among them the Legate *Seripandus* privily, opposed the Decree, whereby it was defined that Christ offered up himself in his last Supper; yet the Decree was promulged, and stood in force.

[1] *Est verum decretum Concilii, quod fit à majori parte; aliquin nullum esset legitimum Concilii decretum, cùm semper aliqui dissentiant.* Bell. de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.

[2] *Ibid. lib.* 1. *cap.* 18.

[3] *Nisi detur locus majori parti suffragiorum.* lib. 1. cap. 21.

[4] *Bos. de signis Eccl.* lib. 16. cap. 9.

[5] *Ejus approbatio sustulit omnem dubitationem.* Hist. Concil. Trid.

Far different was the Opinion of *J. Fr. Picus Mirandula* [6], who in Dissensions of a Council, thought *the major part was to be adhered to, cæteris paribus, that is, provided neither were repugnant to Scripture. But if that happened, then that part was to be followed, either major or minor, which had Scripture on its side. For that if the major part would decree any thing against Scripture, the*

[6] *Quia si pars major contra divinas literas decernere quicquam vellet, numero minori adhærendum esset. Quinimò simplici potiùs rusticæ, & infanti, & anicula, quàm & Pontifici & mille Episcopis credendum, si contra Evangelium isti, illi pro Evangelio verba facerent.* Pic. Theor. 16.

the minor were to be adhered to: Tea, a ſimple Ruſtick, an Infant, and an old Woman were to be believed rather than the Pope and 1000 *Biſhops, if theſe ſpoke againſt the Goſpel, thoſe for it.* Gerſon [7] had ſaid the ſame thing before him: *If any private perſon without Authority ſhould be excellently learned in the Scriptures, his Aſſertion were to be believed in matters of Faith, before the Declaration of the Pope. And in caſe he were preſent in a General Council, he ought to oppoſe himſelf to it, if he perceived the major part, either through malice or ignorance go contrary to the Scriptures.* But if this Opinion be true, and private Men may judge which part in a Council follows Scripture, which the contrary; then as often as there be diſſenſions in Councils, their Power in defining will not be Supreme, as being ſubject to the examination of all Men. Beſide, if the major part of a Council can manifeſtly and directly vote contrary to Scripture, much more can they do it obſcurely and indirectly, and therefore may be even then miſtaken, when their error is not manifeſt. And if ſo, the Decrees of the major part can in no caſe, not *cæteris paribus*, be ſecurely believ'd.

[7] *Si aliquis ſimplex non authoriſatus, eſſet excellenter in S. literis eruditus, potius credendum eſſet in caſu doctrinæ ſuæ aſſertioni, quam Papæ declarationi. Et talis eruditus ſi,* &c. Gerſ. de exam. doctrin. Part. 1. Conſid. 5.

For theſe Reaſons perhaps Cardinal *Turreremata* maintains, [8] That *in a doubtful Controverſie not yet defined, the major part muſt be adhered to.* But neither is this Opinion ſafe. For if we muſt ſtand to the Plurality, ſhall Truth always overcome? Hath Truth that excellent fortune as to pleaſe always the greater part? Let *Canus* be heard: *I deny*, ſaith he, [9] *that in matters of Faith the Judgment of the major part ought to be followed. For we do not here as in Humane Judgments, meaſure the Sentence by the number of Suffrages. We ſee frequently, that the greater overcomes the better part. We know that thoſe things are not always beſt, that pleaſe moſt. We know that in things of Faith the Opinion of wiſe Men is to be preferred. Now Wiſe-men are few, but Fools innumerable. Four hundred Prophets lyed to* Ahab, *while one* Micaiah *ſpoke truth. The greater part of the* 2d. Epheſine *Synod ſided with the wicked* Dioſcorus. *Bannes* [10] his Diſciple hath the like words, and *Salmero* [11] the ſame. And indeed it may eaſily be, that more Heretical than Orthodox Biſhops be preſent in a Council; as well becauſe the greater part of all the Biſhops in the World may be infected with Hereſy, as we ſhall prove hereafter;

[8] *In controverſia quæ dubia eſt & nondum definita, arguendum eſt à majore parte.* Tur. de Eccleſ. lib. 3. cap. 65.

[9] *Nego cum de fide agitur, ſequi plurimorum judicium oportere,* &c. Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5 cap. 5.

[10] Bann. in 2. 2. queſt. 1. art. 10. dub. 4.

[11] Salm. tom. 12. tract. 79.

hereafter; as because the Hereticks, even although fewer in number in the whole Church, may, incited by a perverse zeal, flock to the Council in greater numbers than the Catholicks. Now what can we expect from such an Assembly? What, but that every one should pronounce according to his preconceived Opinion, and decree that which he thinks most true?

The fear of this made the Popes, *Leo* and *Vigilius*, desire before the IV. and V. Councils, that an equal number of Western and Eastern Bishops might be present in them. For the like cause *Richerius* [12] complaineth, That in the Council of *Trent* there were more *Italian* Bishops, than of all other Nations together: And this he makes to be the cause of the exorbitant Power of the Pope in all latter Councils, and of introducing *a new and unheard of way of proceeding* into them; the *Italian* Bishops being almost all the Popes Creatures and obnoxious to him. Thus he computes out of the Acts of the Council, that from the beginning to the end of it there were present 187 *Italian* Bishops, but out of other Nations no more than 80. Further, our Adversaries do not deny, that a Council gathered out of one half of the Christian World may totally err; as for example, The Council of *Constantinople* under *Copronymus* consisting of 338 Bishops, who decreed Images were to be abolished. To make this Council Oecumenical there wanted only the presence of two or three Western Bishops. Suppose them present, and opposing the Decree of all the rest. How must the President then have pronounced, if with the major part, an Oecumenical Council would have erred, and the Decree would have been Heretical in the Opinion of our Adversaries?

[12] Rich. Hist. Concil. lib. 14. cap. ult. *Novam & inauditam rationem procedendi.*

Moved with these Reasons, some of our Adversaries, as well Monarchists as Sorbonists, deny, that plurality of Votes ought to overcome in Councils, and account only those Decrees certain, which are established by the unanimous consent of all. This was the Opinion of *Cusanus* [13] which he proveth from the Eighth Synod, and then adds; *See how consent chiefly in those things which are of Faith is required: and by how much the greater this consent is, so much the more infallible is the Decree. Whence, although in Universal Synods many things be necessary, yet most of all is*

[13] *Ecce concordantiam maximè in iis quæ fidei sunt requiri: & quanto major est concordantia, tantò infallibilius judicium.—Unde licèt in Synodis universalibus plura necessaria sint, maximè tamen communis omnium sententia.* Cus. Concord. Cath. Lib. 2. Cap. 4.

is the common consent of all. So *Holden*: [13] *Although it be the Testimony of the major part of a Council, if it be not universal and general, it hath not the perfect certainty of Tradition.* *Richerius* [14] seemeth to be of the same mind, although he speaks not so plainly. Nor do *Stapleton* [15] or *Duvall* [16] differ from it. But neither doth this Opinion want its inconveniencies. For, first, hereby Councils are in a manner rendred useless. For it cannot easily be imagined, unless some Factious Conspiracy should intervene, that all should think the same thing, especially if they be many. And indeed we have few examples of Councils, wherein the Bishops were unanimous. In that of *Nice* were some *Arians*, at *Sardica* more, at *Ephesus* many *Nestorians*, at *Chalcedon* not a few *Eutychians*; and so of the rest: which according to this Hypothesis must be all expunged out of the number of lawful Councils. Secondly, The Infallibility of Councils will hereby become unuseful; for they could never pronounce Sentence. There would be always two or three Hereticks present in the Council, who to prevent the condemnation of their Heresy, need do no more than speak their Minds, and dissent from the Votes of the rest. Thus the Power of the Universal Church shall be overthrown, and all methods of extinguishing Heresy eluded by the stubbornness of two or three Hereticks. However it be, the Council of *Basil*, which the *Sorbonists* so much extol, thought far otherwise, and particularly the President of it, *Lewis* Cardinal of *Arles*. For when, in treating of defining three Assertions that raised a Council above the Pope, the major part voted the affirmative, although many Fathers, and among them the famous Canonist *Panormitan*, dissented, and even protested against it; yet the President pronounced Sentence in the affirmative, and that Sentence was held valid; as *Æneas Sylvius* [17] largely relates.

Whichsoever Opinion therefore our Adversaries embrace, they involve themselves in inextricable difficulties. But I will not any further urge them. It suffi eth, what none will deny, that it is not certain, whether the major part must take place, or unanimity be required. Both may be defended, and neither is self-evident, nor revealed by God, nor defined by the

[13] *Imò tametsi plurimorum fuerit in Concilio congregatorum testimonium, nisi universum & Catholicum sit, traditionis certitudinem perfectam non habet.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 9.

[14] Rich. Apol ax. 22.

[15] Stapl. de princip. lib. 7. cap. 9.

[16] Duval. Anteloq.

[17] Hist. Concil. Basil. lib. 1.

Church; as all acknowledge. If this then be uncertain, it will be also uncertain what Decrees of Councils were lawfully concluded, and consequently what command and deserve belief.

CHAP. XIX.

That it cannot be known from the subsequent Approbation of the Church, which were lawful Councils.

FRom what hath been hitherto said concerning Councils, it is most evident both from the Reason of Things, and the Principles of our Adversaries, that the Infallibility of Councils is a meer Phantasm; that if there were any Infallible Councils, they must be such as are *Oecumenical*, free, lawful, and rightly proceeding; that it cannot be yet certainly known, whether all these Conditions be singly necessary, and whether all together suffice: That if that were stated, it were unknown, what is required to make a Council *Oecumenical*, what Free, and so in the rest; and much more uncertain, which or whether any were so; that the lawfulness, freedom, right intention, necessary diligence, and other conditions of an Infallible Council can never be certainly apply'd to any particular Synod.

Many of these things are of that nature, that they cannot be known even by the Bishops of the Council themselves. They can tell for example, whether themselves have a right Intention, and be corrupted with no Interest or Passion; but to know whether all the rest be equally sincere, is wholly impossible. They no less than others must be uncertain what are the Conditions necessary to constitute an Infallible Council; which neither God hath revealed, the Church defined, nor the consent of Doctors determined. If these things cannot be known by the Fathers of a Council, how shall they by the other Bishops far distant in the remote parts of the World? How by every one of the common People, by Mechanicks, Husband-Men, and Women, whose Judgment is so small, and Notions so obscure? Again, if not of the present and later Councils, how of the first and ancient ones, which length of time hath involved in darkness,

darkneſs, and left to be known only by Conjectures? How ſhall the moſt learned Men be aſſured of the freedom, legality, and all other neceſſary conditions of theſe Councils, perhaps from the teſtimony of one or two Hiſtorians: as if infinite errors of Hiſtorians were not daily found out, proceeding either from ignorance, malice, or partiality.

But both of ancient and later Councils, this is chiefly to be conſidered, That the conditions neceſſary to make them infallible, are of that nature, that one cannot ſupply the defect of another. It ſufficeth not to have ſome of them, nor even all the reſt, if any one be wanting. This Council muſt at the ſame time be Oecumenical, Lawful, Free, and proceed rightly. If any one of theſe Conditions, or any part of them be wanting, all the reſt are of no value, the Council becomes fallible. Whence many Councils, at leaſt Decrees of Councils, have been rejected, that were deficient but in one Condition.

Hence it may be concluded, Firſt, That the *Sorboniſts* have no firm foundation for their Faith, having nothing to oppoſe to ſo many juſt doubts and reaſonable exceptions: For they think not ſufficient the Judgment of the Pope, declaring any Council to have wanted no neceſſary conditions of Infallibility, and reject many, in favour of which he hath ſo declared. They take their Judgment from the ſole conſideration of the Council it ſelf, and what was acted in it. Secondly, That the Sentence of Pope and Council together is no more certain than that of Pope alone; and that thoſe therefore err, who make not the Judgment of either ſeparately, but of both conjunctly to be a firm Foundation for Faith and Certainty. This might be perhaps with ſome colour of Truth defended, if either all Councils agreeing with the Pope, were admitted as infallible; or it were certainly known what are thoſe Councils which conjoin'd to the Pope obtain that privilege. But both are falſe. For all our Adverſaries, which acknowledge not the Infallibility of Pope alone, allow it not alſo to him when united to a Council not Oecumenical, or not lawfully conſtituted, or not rightly proceeding. Now what Councils are Oecumenical, what lawfully conſtituted, and what rightly proceed, we have proved that none can know. Unleſs the Pope therefore hath Infallibility, no certainty can accrue from his Judgment by the addition of any Council. Which is alſo hence confirmed;

that the Sentence, whereby the Pope pronounceth a Council to have been Oecumenical, Lawful, *&c.* comes from his sole Authority. For although the Council should pronounce the same thing together with him; their Sentence would be of no value, as being pronounced in their own Cause. So that the Decree of the Pope alone can not be of any efficacy in this matter; which, if it cannot afford certainty, neither will the Decree of Pope and Council together, at least no more certainty than that of Pope alone.

Turn therefore the Authority of Pope and Council on all sides, take it separately, conjunctly, divided, united; no certainty, no firmness, no foundation for Divine Faith will be ever obtained. One thing only our Adversaries may pretend, that the Decrees of Councils become then certain, when the Universal Church shall have received them. I have not indeed, yet met with any who alledge this. But I doubt not that many forced by the precedent Arguments will take refuge there; and will therefore, before I proceed any farther, demonstrate the vanity and falseness of this pretence.

And first, I oppose to it, what I before observed, That hereby Particular are equalled and put into the same condition with General Councils, contrary to the sence of all Christians, both Ancient and Modern, who constantly give the greatest deference to General Councils. Not to say, that since hereby firm assent cannot be given to a General Council not received by the Church, nor denied to a particular one received by her; it would be foolish and absurd to call a General Council, with infinite trouble and difficulty, when a particular one may Define and Decree with the same Authority. Secondly, If the Church reject some Councils, admit others, there must be some reason of this different Judgment. This reason must be taken either from the Condition necessary to the Councils Infallibility, as Universality, Freedom, and the rest, or from the matters decreed in the Council, their conformity or repugnance to the rules of Faith. If from the first, all the difficulties which we proposed in the foregoing Chapters, will take place. For whether such a Council were *Oecumenical*, or rightly constituted, or did rightly proceed, being all Matters of Fact, the Universal Church may err in judging of them: and so by her judgment manifested in the reception or rejection of the Council, can neither add to,

nor

nor take away any certainty from it. Besides, I have shewn that the conditions of an infallible Council cannot be known even by the Church when they are fulfilled and when not. For if the Bishops present cannot know it, much less those divided by great distance of place. Can the *Americans* or *Chinese* know whether no bribes, no sollicitation of votes, or making of parties was used at *Trent*? The existence of such a Council they know only by uncertain rumours. In vain is a certain knowledge hoped for. However it be, to determine a thing of this nature and moment requireth an accurate and diligent inquisition and examination of all circumstances. Such an examination neither ever was nor can be made by the Universal Church. For that would require a judiciary kind of process, which the Church out of a Council cannot observe. For our Adversaries ascribe to the Universal Church only a passive infallibility in believing, not an active in defining. But grant she can judge of this matter. Did she ever do it? Was the Council of Trent thus examined by her? What witnesses were heard? What inquisition made, either by all Bishops or any other? The Acts of it were always kept secret, and are to this day held Prisoners in the *Vatican*, far from being submitted to the examination of the Universal Church. The Canons are indeed promulged. But if any one should examine them by himself, whether to be admitted or rejected, as the *Gallican* Church rejected all those Canons, which concern Ecclesiastical Discipline, that respects only the matter of the Council, (*viz.*) The Truth or Falseness, Justice or Injustice of its Decrees, but not the form of it, (*viz.*) The Legality, Right Constitution and Proceeding of it; of which only we are now treating. So *Lupus* [1] tells us that the reason, why almost all the Western Bishops rejected the V. Council, was, not any defect in the form of it, but their respect to the Ancient custom of the Church, of Condemning no man after his Death, that died in Catholick Communion, Honour to the Memory of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, so Famous over all the East, and Reverence to the Canons of *Chalcedon*, whose Authority they thought infringed by the Decrees of this Council. So the Ancient *French* and *English* rejected the Seventh and Eighth Synods, only for the falseness of their Decrees, and defining the Lawfulness of Image worship, which the others looked upon as Idolatry and contrary to the Faith; because *they had defined*

[1] *In Concil.* Tom. 1. p. 742. 7. 44.

defined otherwise than the Orthodox Doctors had defined before them, saith *Ademarus Cabanensis* [2]: Because they Decreed *many things inconvenient and contrary to the true Faith*, saith *Hoveden* [3]. Lastly, that the Church in admitting Councils respects the matter, not the form of them, may be hence proved; because the Church sometimes approveth the Decrees of unlawful Councils, as of *Antiochia*, which [4] *Baronius* accounts unlawful, because Celebrated, while the Indiction of the Synod of *Rome* was yet depending: and did certainly act unlawfully in Condemning *Athanasius*, and substituting to him *Eusebius* a *Laick*, and when he refused *George* the *Cappadocian*, a man unknown to the Church of *Alexandria*. Yet the Canons of this Synod were afterwards received, as also the Decrees of the V. Council; which *Baronius* and with him not a few think to have proceeded Unlawfully.

[2] *De imaginibus adorandis aliter quàm Orthodoxi Doctores antè definierant, statuerunt.* Adem. apud Marcam de Concord. l. 6. c. 15.

[3] *Multa inconvenientia & veræ fidei contraria.* Hoveden ad ann. 792.

[4] *Ad An.* 341.

There remains then to the Church only the latter way of examining Councils, that is from the Matter of them, by examining the truth and falseness of its Decrees, admitting the one and rejecting the other. This Examination we not only admit, but also pray that it may obtain. But then in it supposeth the fallibility (in the first place) of a Council: otherwise why are her Decrees examined? why not all promiscuously and reverently received? Secondly, hereby not a Council, but the Universal Church will be the Supreme and Ultimate Tribunal, as judging and irrevocably giving Sentence upon the Decrees of the Council, which may be either approved or abrogated by her. Thirdly, hence it will also follow, that the Decrees of a Council must not be assented to, till received by the Church, because not till then certainly known to be true: contrary to the constant practice of our Adversaries, by whom the Decrees are admitted immediatly after Sentence pronounced, at least immediatly after the *Pope's* Confirmation. Fourthly, Councils themselves plainly shew that they are of a contrary Opinion by denouncing Anathema's against the Opposers of their Decrees, or Disbelievers of their Definitions, not staying till the Universal Church shall have approved both, which demonstrateth that they believe a supreme and uncontroulable Authority to reside in themselves: And this very argument is made use of by *Bellarmine* to prove that Councils are Supreme in which the *Pope's Legates* are present. Lastly hence it will follow that the Decrees of a Council ought never to be assented to.

For

For the Universal Church is nothing else but the Collection of Christians. If therefore all single Persons expect till the Universal Church receive the Decrees, the Universal Church it self must expect; and so no body shall ever begin to receive and assent to them.

Further, it may be observed, that to make this approbation of the Church of any weight, it were necessary that this Opinion should be generally received, at least not opposed by any Bishop. For then immediatly after the Promulgation of the Decrees, all Bishops would betake themselves to examine them by the Rules of Faith. If after this Examination they received them; then an Approbation of the Universal Church might with some colour be pretended. But now when all, at least almost all, are of a contrary Opinion, and look upon the Decrees, when once confirmed by the Pope, as Infallible; they receive them without any precedent Examination; whereby this Reception becomes of no value, as grounded upon a preconceived Opinion, which we have proved to be false. This may be illustrated by what an Anonymous Author [5] of the *Sorbonists* party saith. He denieth those Subscriptions are to be accounted of; whereby many assent to the Pope's Constitutions when transmitted to them; that they are not to be compared with the Decrees of Councils; because the Bishops act not therein as Judges, nor examine what they subscribe. If this Reason be valid in that case, it will be much more in the confirmation of Councils by the subsequent reception of the Church. For much fewer doubt of the Infallibility of a Council confirmed by the Pope, than of the Infallibility of the Pope alone. He subjoineth another Reason of the Invalidity of these Subscriptions; because they are commonly extorted by threats and fear of being deposed from their Bishopricks, if they should Dissent. But hath not this happened in urging the Reception of a Council. Certainly *Baronius* [6] largly relateth how the Emperour *Justinian* deprived and Banished those Bishops, who would not admit the Decrees of the Fifth Council, and condemn the *Tria Capitula*.

[5] *Les desseins des Jesuites representés a l'assemblée du Clergé.* p. 43.

[6] *Siquidem illi qui damnationem trium Capitulorum non reciperent, Imperatoris jussu in exilium agebantur.* Bar. ad an. 553.

Lastly, it is certain there are very few Councils, if any, to which all Christians, and consequently the Universal Church subscribed. This was shewed before and might be further proved. Whence among many other things these two may be concluded: First, that all Christians never thought the Approbation of the Universal

Univerſal Church to be the only Rule of admitting or rejecting Councils; ſince there is none, which although rejected by the reſt, many did not receive. Secondly that the Unanimous approbation of the whole Church is no ſufficient and ready means to diſcern thoſe Councils to which Obedience is due. For how ſhould it be ſuch, when it is very rarely to be had? Now if this means be not ſufficient; either ſome other muſt be pointed out, which joined or ſubſtituted to it may afford this ſo neceſſary knowledge to the Faithful; or it muſt be acknowledged, that it is often unknown to which Councils aſſent is due. But it ſeemeth incredible to me that God ſhould give to Councils ſo great and ſo admirable a privilege, as is abſolute Infallibility, and this to extinguiſh Hereſies, compoſe Controverſies, and direct the Faithful in the way of truth; and all this while ſhould give no certain or eaſy Sign, whereby Infallible Councils, from which alone we were to receive ſo great happineſs, might be deſtinguiſhed from deluding Conventicles. For this were to violate his own precept, and hide the brighteſt candle in the Church under a buſhel. Yet hath he given none. At leaſt this approbation of the Church, of which alone we now diſpute cannot be here alledged; ſince our Adverſaries have many Councils to which they pretend obedience due, that were not thus approved by the whole Church.

CHAP. XX.

That it cannot be learned from the conſent of Doctors what is to be beleived. I. *Becauſe it doth not appear who thoſe Doctors are,* II. *becauſe thoſe Doctors, whoſoever they are, do not always agree.*

DRiven from Pope and Council, our Adverſaries fly to the Faith of the Univerſal Church. Whether herein they have ſure refuge, is next to be enquired. The Faith of the Univerſal Church may be taken two ways, either as it is taught by

by the Paſtours, or as it is believed, by all the Faithful, both Clergy and Laity. Either way taken our Adverſaries contend it is a certain Rule of Faith to all private Chriſtians; for that nothing falſe can either be taught by a common conſent of all the Paſtors, or be believed by all the Faithful. But ſince it is one and the ſame Faith, which is taught by the Paſtors and believed by the Faithful, it might ſuffice to conſider either of them only, and thence demonſtrate that neither can be a Rule of Faith. Yet that our adverſaries may not complain any thing is omitted: I will treat ſeparately of each; and firſt that Faith cannot be founded upon the common conſent of Doctors.

This may be evinced many ways. Firſt, becauſe it doth not appear, who are thoſe Doctors whoſe conſent is required. The whole foundation of this is thought to be a place of St. *Paul*, [1] where he aſſerts that *Chriſt gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and teachers* (Doctors) *for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt*, &c. But who theſe Paſtors and Doctors are, is uncertain. It is enquired, firſt, whether the ſame be Paſtors that are Doctors. St. *Hierom*, St. *Auguſtin*, *Iſidorus Clarius*, *Ben. Juſtinianus*, and *Lud. Cellotius* thought them the ſame; *Hilarius Diaconus*, *Eſtius*, and *Corn. à Lapide*, different. Next who are deſigned by the word Paſtors. Many underſtand thereby Biſhops, and thoſe only; *Cellotius* [2] Parſons only, and cites *Theodoret* for his opinion. *Eſtius* [3] underſtands both, who alſo cites *Theophylact*. Now theſe queſtions are of great moment. For if Paſtors be the ſame with Doctors, and by both names Biſhops only be deſigned; they only muſt be attended. But if the Apoſtle underſtands Parſons too, it is not enough to know what Biſhops teach: we muſt alſo enquire what Parſons teach. Again, if Profeſſors of Divinity, and Preachers be to be added; we muſt further ſearch out their Doctrine. For if God annexed this privilege of infallibility to the four Orders of Biſhops, Pariſh-Prieſts, Profeſſours, and Preachers taken all together; we muſt not ſo follow one Order, as to neglect the other. For upon that ſuppoſition any one, nay any three of them may err, and truth remain only with the fourth. However it be, it is manifeſt that both ancients and modern differ in this point; and that therefore nothing certain can be had therein, much leſs what is of Faith; which yet is neceſſary to aſſure us that we have an infallible Rule of Faith in the Governours of the Church.

[1] *Ephes.* IV.

[2] *Rectè igitur Theodoretus Paſtores & Doctores eos dicit, qui in civitate & in pago erant deputati & ſegregati. Cell. de Hier. l. 8. c. 6.*

[3] *Dixi præcipuè ſignificari Epiſcopos nomine Paſtorum: nam generaliter huc etiam Parochi pertinent.* Eſt. in loc.

But neither would that ſuffice, if it were of Faith. Somewhat elſe would be yet neceſſary, *viz.* to know certainly whether to give aſſent to the Doctrine of theſe Paſtors and Doctors, whoſoever they be, it be required that all ſhould conſent in their Doctrine, every one of them, which they call All *Mathematically*; or whether the conſent of All *Morally*, that is, almoſt all, will ſuffice: again, who they are exactly that may be called All Morally, and how great a part of the whole may diſſent without prejudicing the infallibility of the reſt, whether the third, or the fourth, or the tenth, or the hundredth, *&c.* Who ſhall define this? If All Mathematically muſt conſent, God would have appointed a Rule, which never exiſted: For ſo abſolute a conſent never was among the Governours of the Church. But he which ſhall ſay, it ſufficeth that almoſt all conſent, ought not only to affirm, but alſo to prove what he ſays. But how ſhall ſo obſcure a thing be proved? Or what certainty can be had in it? Yet grant it can be had; it is ſtill to be defined, when almoſt all can be ſaid to have conſented; for that hath a certain Latitude, wherein ſome Men will think that number to be included, which others hold excluded.

But not to ſeem too ſcrupulous, let our Adverſaries define this as they pleaſe, and almoſt all be accounted to have conſented, when only a tenth, twelfth, or twentieth part ſhall diſſent. Let all this be as certain, as it is indeed doubtful and uncertain. I ask, whether that conſent, which it ſhall have pleaſed our Adverſaries to define neceſſary, is always to be had? If any one think ſo, he muſt be a ſtranger to all Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and never have heard of the prevailing Hereſies of *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, and *Eutyches*, not to mention others. But you will ſay, they were Hereticks, whereas we require only the conſent of Catholicks. Right; but it did not ſenſibly appear they were Hereticks; rather that was then the Queſtion, Who were Hereticks, and who Orthodox. For the *Arians*, *Neſtorians*, and *Eutychians* took to themſelves the name of Catholicks, and branded the reſt with the imputation of Hereſie. Now if this Queſtion, which was certainly a matter of Faith, was to be determined only from the conſent of Doctors, it could never have been determined to the worlds end; ſince that conſent was never to be found. But to deal liberally with our Adverſaries, have not thoſe often diſſented, whom themſelves acknowledge Catholick?

lick? In the ſecond and third Age the *Aſiaticks* diſſented from the *Europeans* about the celebration of *Eaſter*. In the third Age, all the *Africans*, and many of the *Aſiaticks*, from the reſt, about the re-baptization of Hereticks. In the fourth Age, the followers of *Theophilus*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Hierom*, from the favourers of *Origen* about his Condemnation. In the fifth Age, the *Greek* from the *Latin* Church, upon account of the Quarrels between the *Roman* and *Conſtantinopolitan* Sees. In the ſixth Age, the *Africans*, *Dalmatians*, and *Italians*, from the *Greeks* and *Romans*, concerning the Condemnation of the *Tria Capitula*. In the eight and ninth Ages, the *Engliſh*, *French*, and *Germans*, from the *Greeks*, and many of the *Italians*, about Image-worſhip. The *Eaſtern* hath diſſented from the *Weſtern* Church now for many Ages about ſome points of Faith and Diſcipline. The *Weſtern* Church hath been divided for theſe three laſt Ages about the Power of Pope and Council. And all theſe Diſſenſions proceeded even to breaking of Communion, and pronouncing *Anathema's* againſt one another, except the laſt, which alſo did no leſs in the fifteenth Age.

Now as often as this happens, to which part can the Faithful ſecurely adhere? Think not that the moſt are then to be followed; for beſides that there are not always more Patrons of Truth than Error; and that *Canus* [4] and *Bannes* [5] expreſly deny it: It is impoſſible to number Suffrages, and know which Party is moſt numerous. They might be numbred perhaps, if the Church were included in one Province. But now that it is diffuſed throughout the whole World, no mean is left of knowing what is the Opinion either of all or moſt. Our Adverſaries, I ſuppoſe, will ſay, that when the Governours of the Church diſſent about any matter of Faith, the Faithful muſt ſuſpend their aſſent, while the Controverſie endureth, and content themſelves by an implicit Faith to believe in it what the Church believeth, not enquiring in the mean while what the Church believeth, but leaving that to be enquired by the Church her ſelf.

[4] *Nego, cùm de fide agitur, ſequi plurimorum judicium oportere.* Can. loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 5.

[5] *Non negamus, quin multi, immò plures Sacerdotes & Paſtores poſſint errare.* Bann. In 2. 2. qu. 1. art. 10. dub. 3.

To this I anſwer, Firſt, that this grants us all we deſire. For we diſpute here only of explicite Faith, maintaining that our Adverſaries have no certain Foundation for that. If they flee to Implicite, they thereby forſake explicite Faith. Secondly, almoſt all our Adverſaries confeſs that there are ſome Articles, which even the moſt ignorant Chriſtians are bound to

believe with explicite Faith: and *Comink* [6] aſſerts the contrary Opinion of ſome Canoniſts to be held erroneous and even heretical by the other Doctors. Further, all conſent there are ſome points of Faith neceſſary to be believed by all with explicite Faith, not only becauſe commanded to be ſo; but becauſe the explicite belief of them is alſo the means, without which Salvation cannot be obtained. Wherefore *Hoſius* [7], in relating the known ſtory of the Collier, ſaith, he did not make that Anſwer, of believing as the Church believeth, before he had entirely repeated the Apoſtles Creed, and profeſſed his adherence to it. Now ſuppoſe the Biſhops differ about ſome Article neceſſary to be believed with explicite Faith, as happened in the times of *Arianiſm*. Certainly the Faithful cannot at that time ſuſpend their aſſent, if they do not together ſuſpend their hopes of Salvation. But not to inſiſt upon that Example, ſuppoſe a Controverſie raiſed about doing ſomewhat, which God in the Scripture expreſly commands to be done, ſuch as we contend to be Communion under both kinds, reading of the Scripture, &c. What is then to be done? Muſt all action be ſuſpended? This were to deny obedience to God. We muſt therefore chuſe one part, and ſo reject the pretence of implicite Faith. Again, implicite Faith is thus expreſſed, *I believe what the Church believeth.* It therefore ſuppoſeth the Faith of the Church. Of what kind? not implicite ſurely. For that would be abſurd in the higheſt degree. Certainly then the Church could not juſtly be accounted the Keeper of Tradition, which is nothing elſe in our Adverſaries ſence, but that Doctrine which Chriſt delivered to his Apoſtles, they to their Succeſſors, until it was derived down to us. If this be true, the Church of every Age muſt of neceſſity diſtinctly and explicitly know that Doctrine. Otherwiſe it cannot faithfully and accurately deliver it to the ſucceeding Church. Then how ſhall this Faith of the Church her ſelf be expreſſed? It can be by no other Form than this, *I believe what I believe*; than which nothing can be more abſurd. But I need not refute a Folly which our Adverſaries do not eſpouſe, as appears from the words of *Duvall* [8]: *Although ſome things were in proceſs of time defined by the Church, which were before doubted of without the*

[6] *De actib. ſup. diſp. 4. dub. 9.*

[7] *Hoſ. contra Prol. Brent. lib. 3.*

[8] *Quamvis aliqua ſucceſſu temporis fuerint*

in Eccleſiâ definita, de quibus antea citra hæreſin dubitabatur, certum tamen eſt illa fuiſſe ſemper à nonnullis prædicata & declarata. Quòd autem ab aliis non crederentur, iſtud tantùm vel ex oblivione vel ex ignorantiâ Scripturæ aut traditionis proveniebat. Duval. in 2.2. p. 111.

Crime

Crime of Hereſie, yet it is certain they were always preached and declared by ſome. But that they were not believed by others, aroſe either from the forgetfulneſs, or from the ignorance of Scripture or Tradition.

Is it therefore this explicite Faith of the Church, which ſerveth as a Foundation to implicite Faith? So it ought to be, and ſo I doubt not but our Adverſaries will ſay it is. But in this caſe, wherein the Governours of the Church diſſent about an Article of Faith, it cannot be. For that which the Church explicitly believes, is no definite Opinion, but a meer Contradiction repugnant to it ſelf, and deſtroying it ſelf. For one part of the Church believeth the Opinion, whereof the Controverſie is raiſed, to be true, wholſom, and revealed by God; the other part believes it falſe, pernicious, and ſuggeſted by Men. Now, to have the belief of the whole Church, you muſt joyn both parts of the Contradiction together: and ſo the Church believeth that Opinion to be true and falſe, wholſom and pernicious, revealed by God, and ſuggeſted by Men. But this is not Faith, but a deformed Monſter, conſiſting of contrary and repugnant parts.

CHAP. XXI.

That the conſent of Doctors, even when it can be had, is more difficult to be known, than that we can by the help of it attain to the knowledge of the Truth.

TO what we obſerved in the precedent Chapter our Adverſaries may perhaps anſwer, That when the Governours of the Church differ about a matter to be believed, then indeed the Faith of private Chriſtians cannot rely upon their Authority; but that this diſſent is not perpetual, that they oftentimes conſent in delivering the Doctrine of the Church, and then at leaſt may be ſecurely believed in what they teach. To this I reply, Firſt, that hereby they muſt grant they have no certain and fixed Rule of Faith for many great and weighty points of Religion, contrary to their continual boaſts of the abundance of

of Rules, whereby God hath provided for all the neceſſities of his Church. Secondly, the Governours of the Church have now for many Ages differed about ſome matters, upon which, according to our Adverſaries, depend the hopes of eternal Salvation. For Example, whether the true Church is to be found among the *Greeks* or among the *Latins*? For of the five Patriarchates of the Church, four are divided from the Church of *Rome*, and accuſe her of Hereſie and Schiſm, both which Accuſations ſhe retorts upon them. Now, this is a matter of great moment, which may be juſtly doubted of, and can never be determined by the conſent of Doctors.

But to omit that, this conſent, if it could be had, is not ſo manifeſt and obvious, as a Rule of Faith ought neceſſarily to be; which by the confeſſion of all muſt be clear, evident, and eaſie to be applied. This *Duvall*[1] aſſigns for *an eſſential condition of a Rule of Faith*, and acknowledgeth, that *if a Rule obſcurely propoſeth the Myſteries of Faith, it would thereby become no Rule.* And for this reaſon our Adverſaries ſo much exaggerate the obſcurity of Scripture, that they may thereby ſhew it could not be given by God for a Rule of Faith. To which end, *Gr. à Valentia*[2] layeth down this Axiom, which he afterwards applyeth to the Scripture. *The Sentence of that Authority which is to judge of all matters of Faith, ought to be manifeſt, that it may be eaſily underſtood by all the Faithful. For if that Authority doth not teach perſpicuouſly and plainly, it will be of no uſe to that end.* So he, and with him many others. If therefore I ſhall ſhew, that the conſent of Paſtors about matters of belief is ſo obſcure and difficult to be known, that even the moſt learned, much more illiterate men cannot avoid Error in ſearching it out; I ſhall thereby prove, that it could not be given to us by God as a common Rule of things to be believed.

[1] *Secunda conditio, eaque pariter eſſentialis, eſt perſpicuitas. Nam ſi hæc regula obſcurè fidei myſteria proponeret, regula fidei non foret.* Duvall in 2. 2. p. 207.

[2] *Sententiam ejus authoritatis, cujus de rebus omnibus fidei judicium eſt, apertam oportet eſſe, ut ab omnibus fidelibus commodè poſſit intelligi. Nam ſi non ita perſpicuè & planè authoritas illa doceat, non ad eam rem valebit.* Val. tom. 3. diſp. 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. §. 4.

This obſcurity and difficulty ariſeth from three Cauſes. The firſt is the amplitude of the Church diffuſed throughout the whole World; which permits not the Faith of all Paſtors to be known, unleſs we travel through all thoſe Regions, wherein they are diſperſed. For it ſufficeth not to conſult a few. They may be miſtaken. The Opinion of all muſt be asked, the conſent

ſent of all appear. But how ſhall they be all ſingly conſulted? Who ever learned the Chriſtian Faith this way? Yet this way Card. *Richlieu* [3] points out to us. He ſaith, the uniformity of the Church is manifeſt to ſenſe; that all parts of the Church may be ſurveyed by one man at divers times, or by divers men at one time. True; but to reduce this to practice, every ſingle man muſt take ſo many Journeys, ſend out ſo many Intelligencers; that this Method cannot be perſwaded but in jeaſt. *Valentia* [4] the Jeſuit is more ingenuous, who confeſſeth, that *it can rarely happen that it may be ſufficiently known what is the Opinion in Religion of all Doctors living at the ſame time.* And this he underſtands in reſpect of the Pope himſelf, as appears from what follows theſe words. If then the conſent of Doctors can rarely be known by the Pope, who hath his Nuncio's and Emiſſaries in all places, how ſhall it ever be known by private Men? *Tanner* [5] ſaith the ſame thing, as he is cited by *Martinonus*. *If it were neceſſary*, ſaith he, *that all private men ſhould know evidently what is believed in the whole Church, how many years muſt be ſpent in acquiring that Evidence, which even learned men have not always?* And *Martinonus* [6] ſaith, *The Pope may be certainly and eaſily conſulted, not ſo the whole Church, no, not all her Paſtors only.*

[3] *Method. liv. 1. chap. 14.*

[4] *Fatendum eſt rarò accidere poſſe, ut quæ ſit doctorum omnium uno tempore viventium de religione ſententia ſatis cognoſcatur.* Va. ubi ſupr. §. 46.

[5] *Si opus eſſet, ut plebeii ſcirent evidenter in totâ Eccleſiâ ſic credi; quot anni laberentur, dum iſtam evidentiam acquirerent, quam neque periti ſemper habent?* Tann. apud Mart. de fide diſp. 3. Sect. 4.

[6] *Certò & facilè poteſt conſuli Pontifex, non ſic tota Eccleſia, ne quidem omnes illius Paſtores.* Mart. de fide diſp. 9. Sect. 9.

This may be proved by many Examples, of which I will produce ſome few. *Bellarmine* [7] and *Valentia* [8] aſſert, that all Divines agree concerning the puniſhment of Infants dying without Baptiſm, and think it only *pœna damni* undergone in that which they call the *Limbus puerorum*. Yet is this Opinion falſly by them aſcribed to all, even Modern Divines (for among the Ancients St. *Fulgentius* is known to have taught the contrary.) *Florentius Conrius*, Titular Arch-biſhop of *Tuam*, publiſhed a Book, wherein he endeavoured to prove the contrary, approved by fourteen Doctors of Divinity; whereof one *Fr. Sylvius* teſtifieth *Conrius* his Opinion is the common Doctrine of the School of *Doway*: Another, *James Pollet*, profeſſeth, that for thirty years, wherein he had been converſant in the Divinity Schools, he had never heard any other Opinion taught by the Profeſſors, than that unbaptized Infants are condemned to the eternal Torments of Hell. A third,

[7] Bell. de amiſſ. Stat. lib. 5. c. 6.

[8] Val. tom. 4. diſp. 11. qu. 1. punct. 1. §. 3. *omnes Theologi, univerſa Theologorum Schola.*

third, *H. Rampen* [9], Professor of *Doway*, saith, That *he had always judged that Opinion, being St.* Augustine's, *to be truest, defended and taught it as more consonant to the ancient Doctors, and always even to this day taught by some most excellent Persons, being founded upon Scripture and Councils.*

[9] *Quam S. Augustini sententiam verissimam semper judicavi, defendi & doceri tanquam antiquioribus Ecclesiæ doctoribus conformem, & semper hucusque ab excellentissimis quibusdam edoctam, utpote Scripturis magis innixam & Conciliis.*

Of Indulgences our Adversaries teach chiefly three things. I. That there is a Treasure of the Satisfaction of Christ and the Saints, which may be applied to persons liable to suffer the punishment of their sins, after the guilt of them is remitted in the Sacrament of Penance; and that this Treasure is actually applied by Indulgences granted by the Pope. II. That the Souls in Purgatory may be helped by these Indulgences. III. That by them is remitted not only the punishment enjoyned in Penance, and decreed by the Canons of the Church, but also that which is due at the Tribunal of God. These three things *Bellarmin* and *Valentia* affirm to be taught by all Divines. Although the first, *Bellarmin* confesseth, was doubted of by *Mairo* and *Durandus*, who thought the Satisfaction of Saints have no part in that Treasure; but the contrary, saith he [10], *is the common Opinion of the other Divines, as well Ancient, as of all the Modern*, and was confirmed by a Decree of *Clement* VI. The Second he acknowledgeth was denied by *Hostiensis* and *Gabriel*; but saith, the latter corrected his Error, and that *it is a thing most certain, and undoubted among Catholicks.* So *Valentia* [11] saith, it is the assertion of all the Orthodox. As for the Third, *Valentia* affirms the contrary Opinion is exploded as erroneous by all the Orthodox. Who could imagine after all this, there were any doubt concerning these points among them? Yet *Holden* [12] teacheth that this only is certain and undoubted, that the Governours of the Church can and ought sometimes to indulge something, and mitigate the severity of the Canons in each Tribunal. *All the rest are doubtful, and disputed of by Divines on both parts, to wit, whether there be a Treasure, of which the Pope and other Pastors of the Church are dispensers*, &c. where he largely shews that all these Propositions are many ways doubted of, and wholly uncertain among Divines.

[10] *Communis aliorum Theologorum tum antiquorum tum recentiorum omnium sententia.* Bell. de Indulg. lib. 1. cap. 2.

Res certissima, & apud Catholicos indubitata.

[11] *Val. tom. 4. disp. 7. qu. 20. punct. 5.*

[12] *Cætera omnia dubia sunt, & a Theologis in utramque partem agitata.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 2. cap. 6.

If

If it be enquired, whether the Church can put Hereticks to death? *Valentia* [13] anſwers, That *'tis not only certain, but of Faith, that the Church can lawfully and conveniently do it. Holden* [14] on the contrary maintains, That *to inflict death upon convicted, relapſed, or even the moſt obſtinate Hereticks, was never an Opinion of the Chriſtian Religion and the Univerſal Church. Neither do all, even the moſt Pious and Learned Catholicks, approve the uſe and methods of the Inquiſition.* The like ſaith *Richerius* [15]. If again it be enquired, whether the corruption of humane nature, introduced by ſin, conſiſts only in the loſs of ſupernatural Graces, or alſo includes ſomewhat poſitive, whereby the Soul is vitiated? *Rhodius* [16] anſwers in the firſt ſence, and affirms, That *all the Orthodox Divines ſo teach againſt all the Sectaries.* Bellarmin [17]: That *it is taught by the common conſent of all.* Yet *Vaſquez* [18] attributes the contrary Opinion to many Divines of great name, as *Holcot, Greg. Ariminenſis, Gabriel, Henricus, Gulielmus Pariſienſis, Autiſſiodorenſis, Driedo.*

[13] *Ex fide certum eſt Eccleſiam licitè & convenienter id facere poſſe.* Val. tom. 3. diſp. 1. qu. 11. punct. 3.

[14] *Nunquam fuit religionis Chriſtianæ & Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ dogma Catholicum. Nec omnes etiam piiſſimi & doctiſſimi Catholici inquiſitionis uſum & rationem approbant.* Hold Anal. fid. l. 1. c. 9.

[15] *Rich. Hiſt. Concil. l. 1. c. 12.*

[16] *Ita contra ſectarios omnes docent Orthodoxi omnes Theologi.* Rhod. de pecc. diſ. 4. qu. 2. Sect. 3.

[17] *Omnes communi conſenſu docent.* Bell. de grat. primi hom. cap. 5. [18] *Vaſq. 1. 2. diſp. 132. cap. 4. & 5.*

It is a Famous Queſtion, whether the Pope, beſides the Spiritual Power, commonly attributed to him, hath a power over Temporals, either direct or indirect, whereby he depoſes Princes for Hereſie, or any other Crime, and abſolve their Subjects from their Allegiance. There are three Opinions about this. The firſt is, that the Pope hath, *jure divino*, a direct and abſolute Power over the whole World, as well in Temporals, as in Spirituals. The Second, that the Pope, as Pope, hath no Temporal Power, nor any Authority to deprive Princes. The Third, that the Pope, as Pope, hath not directly any Temporal, but only Spiritual Power; yet that by means of that Spiritual, he hath indirectly a Supream Power even in Temporals. *Bellarmin* [19], who relateth theſe three Opinions in theſe very words, attributes the firſt to many of the Canoniſts: the third he makes the common Opinion of Catholick Divines: The ſecond he ſaith is not ſo much an Opinion as an Hereſie, and therefore he aſcribes it only to *Calvin, P. Martyr, Brentius*, and the *Magdeburgenſes*: And in another place, under the feigned

[19] *Bell. de Pont. lib. 5. cap. 1.*

name of *Adolphus Schulkenius*, he teacheth the same thing, where he enveigheth [20] against *Widdrington* (a defender of the second Opinion) as *opposing the H. Scriptures, the Doctrine of Councils and Popes, and the unanimous consent of Fathers and Doctors, who all with one Mouth teach the Pope's Supreme Power in Temporals; and thereby ranking himself with Heretics and Schismatics, while he pretends to be a Catholick.* Thus *Bellarmin.* Now on the other side, *De Marca* and *Launoy* contend this Opinion was always unknown in *France.* The whole *Sorbon* in the Exposition of their Judgment published in the Year 1663 testify, That not only they never received this Opinion, but always resisted it with their utmost power. Not to say, that the Kings of *France*, and Parliaments of *Paris* by their Edicts and Arrests often condemned it, and forbid it to be held or taught, particularly in the Years 1561, 1594, 1595, 1610, 1614, *&c.*

[20] *Contra S. literas doctrinam conciliorum & summorum pont. unanimem consensum patrum & doctorum haereticis schismaticisque se jungit.* Apud Widd. contra Schulk. §. 15.

I might produce many more examples; but these suffice to shew, That the greatest Doctors mistake in imagining some Opinions to be approved by all the Divines of their Communion, which yet are freely disputed of on both sides. And if this happens to Doctors, who employ their whole time in matters of learning, what shall we think of poor and illiterate Men, who know little beyond the providing for the necessities of this life? Again, If the Judgment of only those Doctors, who commit their Opinions to Writing, and are very few in comparison of the rest, is not certainly known; how shall we know the Judgment of those who teach their Flocks *vivâ voce*? Lastly, If their Opinion be true who would have the Judgment not only of Bishops, but also of Parsons, Professors of Divinity, and Preachers to be accounted of? what hope is there, that the Opinion of so many Men should ever be known to any one Man, or to any but God alone?

The second Reason of the difficulty of knowing the common consent of other Doctors, is, the obscure Knowledge which is in the Church, of some points, concerning which no Disputation hath been yet raised. For nothing is more true, than that Opinions are illustrated by Controversies. So St. *Augustin* [21] saith, *Many things pertaining to*

[21] *Multa ad fidem Catholicam pertinentia dum haereticorum callidâ inquietudine agitantur, ut adversum eos defendi possint, & considerantur diligentius, & intelliguntur, clarius & instantius praedicantur, & ab adversario mota quaestio exstitit discendi occasio.* August. de Civit. Dei, lib. 16. chap. 20.

Catholick

Catholick Faith, while they are disputed of by the cunning perverseness of Heretickes, that they be defended against them, are considered more diligently, understood more clearly, and preached more earnestly; the Question moved by the Adversary becoming an occasion of learning. This he proves in another place [22] by the Doctrines of the Trinity, Penance and Baptism, not fully handled before the Controversies started in them by the *Arians*, *Novatians*, and *Rebaptizers*: And therefore *Valentia* [23] affirms, *It belongs to the Church, as necessity shall require, to deliver anew to the Faithful more explicitly, and by an Infallible Authority, as it were draw out of darkness those truth of Faith, which were indeed at first delivered by the Apostles; but now either by the negligence or perversity of Men lay hid. And perhaps,* saith he, *some do yet lay hid in the Church.* An eminent example of this appeared in the Council of *Trent*; when they were seeking out an efficacious remedy against the inconveniencies of clandestine Marriages. Some advised the declaring them void for the future; and these were the major number. Fifty Bishops, and among them the Patriarch of *Hierusalem*, and two of the Legates, Card. *Hosius* and *Simonetta*, opposed it, saying, *That was not in the power of the Council.* *Morone* the Legate, and many others suspended their Votes. The Disputations grew high; at last they agreed to referr all to the Pope. He answered, the Council had Power to make such a Decree, and that it ought to be made. Hereupon clandestine Marriages were declared void; and an *Anathema* added to the Decree against all those who should thenceforth deny the Church hath power to make Constitutions of that nature. See a Power residing in the Church now become an Article of Faith, which was vehemently impugned by a Patriarch, two Legates, fifty Bishops, and doubted of by many others. And shall those now be heard, who maintain there is always in the Church a clear and distinct knowledge of all things revealed?

[22] *In* Psalm 34.

[23] Val. tom. 3. disp. 1. quæst. 1. punct. 6. *Et fortasse latent adhuc in Ecclesia aliqua.*

We proceed to the third Reason, which consisteth in this, That some Opinions are often divulged in the Church as revealed by God, and approved by the Church, and are everywhere taught, which at last are found out and known to be false. Monsieur *Pajon* [24] produceth three eminent Examples of this Observation; the first taken from the decisions of the Canonists, the second from the form of Condemnation of the V.

[24] Rép. aux prejuges part. 2. chap. 2.

Janſenian Propoſitions; the third from the Prohibition of reading the Bible; which becauſe he largely and accurately purſueth, I will not here urge; much leſs will add other Examples before pointed out in this Chapter. However, from what hath been ſaid, it appears, that it is obſcure and difficult to be known wherein the Doctors conſent. This will be more manifeſt, if we conſider, that it is far more difficult to know certainly what all the preſent Doctors teach, than what the former Doctors taught. For the Opinions of theſe we have in their Books, which we can read at home; but to know the Judgment of the others we muſt travel through the whole World. *Valentia* ſuppoſeth this very thing, where he giveth the reaſon why the Pope in defining rather maketh uſe of dead than living Doctors: Becauſe, ſaith he, [25] *the Opinion of theſe latter can very rarely be ſufficiently known. For being diſperſed through the whole Church, they cannot all eaſily be either aſſembled, or asked what they think; whereas the ancient Doctors are more famous, and are not ſo many.* If this be true, how difficult muſt it be to know the Judgment of the preſent Church; ſince the moſt learned Men can very hardly obtain the Sence of the Ancient Church? Few or none can ſearch all the Monuments of Antiquity, pry into the moſt ſecret Receſſes of it, and turn over the Writings of ſixteen Ages; and in all this long Journey make no ſlips, commit no errors: Yet is all this eaſier in the Judgment of *Valentia*, than to enquire and find out the Opinion of the Doctors living at any one time; which yet muſt be done by them, who lay the Foundation of their Faith upon their conſent.

[25] *Qui proindè omnes nec facilè congregari nec interrogari poſſunt quid ſentiant.* Val. Tom. diſp. 1. quæſt. 1. punct. 7. § 46.

I have not yet ſeen any of our Adverſaries, who offereth the leaſt ſolution of any one of theſe difficulties, except Cardinal *Richlieu*; who when he had objected to himſelf, That blind Men hear neither all Preachers and Doctors, nor learn from thoſe, which they do hear, what the others teach, which is our very Argument, except that what he ſaith only of Blind-men, we juſtly apply to all Men; he anſwers, [26] That *as for a Philoſopher to conclude all Fires to be hot, it is not neceſſary that he experiments all the Fires in the World, the common conſent of Philoſophers ſufficing: ſo to know certainly, whether any Doctrine be the Doctrine of the Church it abundantly ſufficeth, that Blind-men hear it propoſed by divers Doctors of the Church, and that it cannot be ſhown there are others who teach the contrary.*

[26] Method. liv. 2. chap. 8.

But

But many things may be here obſerved. Firſt, Thoſe things do not always ſuffice in matter of Faith, with which we are contented in diſputing. There we often argue from Conceſſions, which we own to be falſe: Here nothing is to be produced but what is true and certain. Wherefore if no body oppoſe thoſe Doctrines which ſeem true to us, it doth not follow that we ought to admit them, unleſs they be both certain of themſelves, and appear ſo to us: And if no body points out to us any maintainers of the contrary Doctrine, it doth not therefore follow, that there are none; whence the Doctrine propos'd, obtains not thence any certainty, any motive of Faith. Secondly, Philoſophers themſelves admoniſh, great diligence is to be uſed in making Arguments of *Induction*, ſuch as this is; and that an inſufficient enumeration of particulars is the great fountain of Errors; while a few, or even many, are reckoned up, and thence a concluſion made of all. Wherefore he reaſons not well, who argues thus, *Such and ſuch teach thus; nor doth any appear who oppoſeth, Therefore all teach the ſame.* For it may eaſily be that many may teach otherwiſe, unknown to him who reaſons thus, but well known to others.

In the next place, it were to be deſired the Cardinal had explained his mind more clearly, and told by whom he means it cannot be ſhewn that other teach the contrary; whether by the blind Man himſelf, or by other blind or ignorant Men like himſelf, or by one Learned Man whom he ſhould conſult, or by all Learned men every where diſperſed. If he means the firſt or ſecond, then he greatly errs in thinking it ſufficient that the blind Man or other ignorant Perſons of his acquaintance cannot name any, who teach a contrary Doctrine to their Pariſh-Prieſt or thoſe Doctors whom they hear. For all the Husbandmen, Labourers, and Mechanicks of the Pariſh may be eaſily ignorant, that a contrary Doctrine, and that more true, is taught in *America* or *India* or even the next Province; and ſo the blind Man ſhall be obliged to believe a falſity. But if the Cardinal means it ſuffice, that the blind Man conſult ſome learned Man to know, whether none teacheth contrary to his Parſon; I would ask, whether our Adverſary requireth it as neceſſary? If ſo, then all the common ſort of the Faithful are guilty of raſhneſs and imprudence. For I dare ſwear that none of them ever puts this in practice. If he ſaith it is not neceſſary;

ceſſary, he deſerts the cauſe. For upon what foundation ſhall their Faith rely, who do not that which he confeſſeth not neceſſary to be done, and yet think ſufficient to confirm their Faith? But what if the Doctor, who is conſulted, be in the ſame errour with the Pariſh-Prieſt, as none will deny he eaſily may? It cannot be imagined that Doctor will tell the conſulter the thing is not taught by the Church, which himſelf thinks to belong to Faith. Or what if that Doctor be ignorant that others, and thoſe Learned Men teach the contrary; as we proved might eaſily happen in the precedent chapter? That anſwer ſurely cannot be ſufficient to ground Faith upon, which can be falſe. For as *Martinonus* [4] truly ſaith. *To believe with undoubting and Infallible Faith, ſuch is Divine Faith, is required an Infallible Argument.* Laſtly, that the Cardinal meaneth it ſufficeth that none in the World can ſhew the Parſon teacheth what is repugnant to others, I can never be induced to believe, ſince a more fooliſh ſence could not be invented. For not the moſt ſagacious Perſon, much leſs a blind Man, could make ſo diligent an inquiry as to be aſſured that none ſuch can be found in the whole World. Add hereto, that it is not more difficult to know directly whether any do teach otherwiſe, than to know whether there be any who can ſhew that it is any where taught otherwiſe: And ſo all our former Arguments will return with their full force againſt this anſwer. But to omit all this, I ask whether any ignorant Perſon uſing ſuch diligence to inquire whether what is taught by his Parſon, is taught unanimouſly by all the other Governours of the Church, as can be expected from a Man of his circumſtances and capacity, can be deceived therein? If he cannot; all thoſe Learned Men, whom I mentioned in the laſt Chapter will be guilty of a moſt intolerable negligence and ſupinity, as being miſtaken in that, wherein even the moſt ignorant cannot be deceived. If he can, then he is not certain, and therefore hath no Faith. For Faith muſt be certain.

[4] *Ad credendum fide indubitatâ & infallibili; qualis eſt fides divina, requiritur argumentum infallibile.* Mart. de diſp. 3. ſect. 4.

CHAP

CHAP. XXII.

That it doth not ſuffice it be known that any thing is taught Unanimouſly by the Governours of the Church, unleſs it appear that it is taught to be of Faith. But that this is moſt uncertain.

FRom what hath been ſaid it is manifeſt, that neither do the Governours of the Church always conſent; nor if they do, can their conſent be certainly known. But ſuppoſe both. The controverſy is not yet ended. For not whatſoever they unanimouſly affirm, is to be received as the revelation of God, and the Doctrine of the Church; but only what they unanimouſly maintain to be of Faith. This *Canus* and *Bellarmin* plainly inſinuate: The firſt, [1] when he ſaith, *the Paſtors of the Church cannot err in the Faith, but whatſoever they teach the faithful People, that it belongs to the Faith of Chriſt, is moſt true*: Bellarmin: [2] *that whatſoever all the Biſhops teach as belonging to Faith, is neceſſarily true and of Faith.* Therefore, *Flor. Corrius* defends himſelf againſt the unanimous conſent of Doctors, who taught 500. Years ſince that unbaptized Infants were not puniſhed with the torments of fire, by pretending that *they did not teach or propoſe this as of Faith.* And indeed it cannot but be abſurd, that the conſent of Paſtors ſhould reach farther than the Infallibility of Pope, or Council, or the Univerſal Church, which as we have before obſerved, is acknowledged not to take place, but in matters which they propoſe as of Faith. Laſtly, the Council of *Trent*, *Pius* V. and divers Provincial Councils wiſhed, that the Catechiſm of *Trent* might be admitted every where, and be uſed by all Paſtors in the inſtruction of their people. Perhaps this is obſerved: For why ſhould it not be! This whole Book then may be reckoned among thoſe things which all Paſtors propoſe to their flocks, not as pertaining to Faith, but as true and wholſom. If therefore, whatſoever all propoſe, muſt neceſſarily be true; there can be nothing falſe, nothing uncertain in this Book. Yet none will deny there are taught in it

[1] *Quicquid fidelem populum docent, quod ad Chriſti fidem attineat.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 4. cap. 4.

[2] *Id quod docent tanquam ad fidem pertinens.* Bell. de Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 14.

[3] *Non tanquam fidem docuerint aut propoſuerint.* Con. de ſtatu parv. cap. 19.

it many Propositions false, more uncertain, and none which might not safely be denied, if they received not their Authority from some other Fountain. Wherefore it is no where admitted as of Infallible authority; a manifest Argument, that those things may be false, which are not taught as of Faith, although taught unanimously.

Before we believe therefore the Doctrine of the Governours of the Church, we must consider how they teach it, whether as of Faith; if not, we must suspend our assent. Now Bishops, Parsons, and Preachers, are wont to teach what seems true to them, and agreeing with Divine Revelation; but very rarely to admonish whether what they teach be of Faith, or a consequent of Faith, whether expresly revealed, or cohærent to things revealed. This *Holden* acknowledgeth. *We never heard*, saith [4] he, *that the Church in delivering the Christian Doctrine exhibited, or composed a Catalogue of revealed Articles, and Divine Institutions, whereby these Articles of divine Faith might be separately and distinctly known from all others, which are either of Ecclesiastical Institution, or not immediately founded upon Divine Revelation, but taught all together confusedly and indistinctly.* Hence even those Divines who agree in the truth of any Article, often differ in judging whether it be of Faith; as we saw before concerning the supreme Power of the Pope. Wherefore *Holden* affirms there are much fewer Articles of Divine and Catholick Faith, than Divines commonly think; and therefore bestows the whole Latter part of his Analysis in composing a Catalogue of such Articles: which would indeed have been very useful, if it were received by all. But he hath omitted some things, which others contend to be of Faith; and inserted others, which some would have omitted. Further in this matter, I appeal to the experience of all Persons; who if they shall ask any of our Adversaries what the Church teacheth concerning Image worship, Invocation of Saints, or the like, will be convinced by their different answers, That it is not ealie to say what the Church teacheth. And if this be difficult to learned Men, how shall it be possible to ignorant Persons?

[4] *In Doctrinâ Christianâ tradendâ nunquam audivimus Ecclesiam articulorum revelatorum & divinarum institutionum Catalogum exhibuisse vel composuisse, quo separatim & distinctè cognosci possent hujusmodi fidei dogmata ab aliis omnibus, quæ vel Ecclêsiastica sunt institutionis, vel certè quæ revelationi divinæ haud immediatè innitantur; atque adeò omnia simul confusè & indistinctè docuisse.* Hold. Anal. fid. lib. 1. cap. 8.

Our

Our Adverſaries cannot juſtly pretend, as many of them do, that the Doctors may diſſent in thoſe things, which are of Theological, not Divine right, and belong rather to the Schools than to the Pulpit, without either the knowledge or the damage of the People; but cannot diſſent in matters of Faith, unleſs their diſſenſions be preſently known, becauſe diſputations, ſtrifes and Schiſms preſently ariſe from them, which occaſion either the Decree of a Pope or the calling of a Council to extinguiſh the diſſenſion, and caſt the heretical part out of the Church. That every Laick therefore, both may and ought to be perſwaded of the truth of thoſe things, which his Paſtour teacheth to be of Faith, while he ſeeth none oppoſing him; although himſelf doth not inquire, whether others teach the ſame thing. So *Suarez* [5]. But here many things are ſuppoſed which cannot be granted. Firſt, it is not neceſſary, that as often as a Doctor propoſeth any thing to be of Faith, which is not ſo, ſome others ſhould riſe to oppoſe him. We daily ſee the contrary not only in Pariſhes, but even in Univerſities, where the Wits of Men are more eaſily excited to controverſy: yet there ſome affirm, others deny many matters to be of Faith, without any ſubſequent Schiſms or Animoſities.

[5] De fide diſp. 5. Sect. 1.

Secondly, if any Diſputation, or Oppoſition ſhould ariſe herein; it is not neceſſary it ſhould ever come to the ears of the common People. Every one knows how hot the Controverſy about the Pope's Infallibility hath for ſome Ages been, eſpecially in *France*, where are many Defenders of each Opinion. Yet ſome Years ſince, when I was in that Country, talking with a Prieſt, and him no ordinary Perſon, but a man famous in the neighbourhood, and Doctor of Divinity, when I ſaid the Pope's Infallibility was denied by many, and particularly by the *Sorbon*, he grew very angry, ſaid it was moſt falſe, and confidently maintained that no Catholick Divine ever doubted of it. Nor could I free the Man from his errour, whatſoever I then offered to him. See another example more remarkable. I was preſent at *Paris* in an Aſſembly of Learned Men, who met weekly to treat of matters of learning. They then diſputed of the Pope's Infallibility, which a Prieſt ſaid was lately rejected by the *Gallican* Clergy in their Synod. At that an Abbot who preſided over the Aſſembly, and had the repute of a very Learned Man, was not a little moved, and denied any ſuch thing was ever done by the Clergy. He acknowledged indeed that the Pope could err, whenſoever he gave his opinion as a Private

Doctor, and that the Clergy meant no more than this: but that there was no Catholick, who did not hold his judgment Infallible, whensoever he pronounced *ex cathedrâ*: and whatsoever the Priest could say, he would not be perswaded that there was any dissension among Divines in this matter. If this Learned Abbot could be ignorant of so notorious a thing; what shall we think of illicerate Christians?

Thirdly, it is not necessary, that as often as dissensions arise in matters of Faith, Schism should thence immediately be produced, and occasion a Decree of the Pope, or calling of a Council. How many things did *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* teach against the Faith, which yet were not canvalled of many Years after his Death? All acknowledge the number of Canonical Books of Scripture, the necessity of the Eucharist, and state of the Dead to be of Faith: Yet none will deny the Ancients differed in judgment as to all these things; and all know that no Schisms, Disputes, or Anathema's of Councils arose therefrom. But not to depart from this very question: What can be more of Faith, than the Rule of Faith it self, and the most essential condition of that Rule, Infallibility? Many Doctors of the Church denied this in the XIV. and XV. ages, as we before proved; yet no Schism, no Decree of the Church was occasioned thereby.

But to shew the sophistry of this objection more evidently, it may be observed, that there are five sorts of things, which, although not belonging to Faith, may be in the Church proposed as of Faith. I. Things true, but not revealed. II. Neither true nor revealed, but not repugnant to Revelation. III. Repugnant to things revealed, but such, as it is not manifest that they were revealed. IV. Repugnant to things manifestly revealed, but so as that repugnance is obscure and remote, not clear and immediate. V. Clearly repugnant to things manifestly revealed. Concerning matters of the last rank this objection might have some force, but not much: since the contrary may be shewn in some examples. But for the four first Classes it hath no colour of truth. They may be all taught as of Faith, and that, daily, yet be observed and regarded by none, much less violently opposed by any. The want of apparent opposition therefore sufficeth not to make what any one Doctor proposeth as of Faith, to be so. The consent and con-

concurrence of all in teaching the ſame to be of Faith, muſt be aſcertained. Otherwiſe aſſent to it will be fooliſh and raſh, at leaſt uncertain.

CHAP. XXIII.

That it is not certain thoſe things are true, which are unanimouſly taught by all Paſtors.

THat it is uncertain, what the Governours of the Church unanimouſly teach, we have proved; yet grant it certain: Can we ſecurely believe this their unanimous conſent? What if they may all err? This our Adverſaries will ſay they cannot. But is that certain and undoubted? If not, in vain is it alledged. They will perhaps ſay it is; nay, and of Faith, ſo as it cannot be denied without open Hereſy. So *Duvall* [1], and many others. And indeed, if it be not of Faith that all the Paſtors conſenting cannot err, Faith cannot rely upon their Authority. Yet is this moſt falſe; for we before proved theſe two Propoſitions. I. That nothing is of Faith, whoſe contrary is held and taught by Catholick Divines, the Church knowing and not cenſuring their Oppoſition. II. That the greateſt Divines of the *Roman* Church, Doctors, Biſhops, and Cardinals taught; 1. That the whole Clergy might be infected with Hereſy. 2. That the Church, to which Infallibility was promiſed, might conſiſt in one Laick, or one Woman, the reſt apoſtatizing from the Faith. This was the Opinion of *Alenſis*, the Author of the *Gloſs upon the Decretals*, *Lyra*, *Occam*, *Alliaco*, *Panormitan*, *Turrecremata*, *Peter de Monte*, *S. Antoninus*, *Cuſanus*, *Clemangis*, *Jacobatius*, *J. Fr. Picus*. But who can imagin ſo many, and ſo great Men, either not to have known what is of Faith, or wilfully to have taught the contrary?

[1] In 2.2. p. 106.

This moved *Suarez* to eſteem the Infallibility of the Paſtors thus conſenting uncertain. *It is asked*, ſaith he [2], *whether all the Biſhops of the Church can agree in any error? For among Catholicks, ſome affirm*

[2] *Petitur an omnes Epiſcopi Eccleſiæ poſſint convenire in aliquo errore. Nam inter Catholicos quidam affirmant, quia non invenitur promiſſio. Alii negant, quia, &c. Mihi verò neutrum videtur ſatis exploratum probabile autem eſt ad providentiam Chriſti pertinere, ut id non permittat.* Suar. de fide diſp. 5. Sect. 6.

firm it, becauſe there is no promiſe found (of the contrary:) Others deny it, becauſe the whole Church would be otherwiſe in great danger of error. To me neither ſeemeth ſufficiently certain. Yet it is probable, that it becomes the Providence of Chriſt not to permit it. In theſe words two things may be obſerved. Firſt, That *Suarez* ſpeaks of the Infallibility of Biſhops not in believing, but in teaching. For he ſaith this in anſwer to an Objection, That if all the Biſhops could err, then the other part of the Church, the Laity, might alſo err, becauſe they ordinarily follow the Doctrine of their Paſtors, and are bound to do it. Now the People are bound to follow their Paſtors, not in what they think, but in what they teach. This alſo appears from the reaſon why ſome denied the conſent of all Biſhops in any error to be poſſible, becauſe, if that ſhould happen the whole Church would be brought into great danger of error. But if Biſhops ſhould teach rightly, although they thought erroneouſly, there would be thence no danger of Error to the reſt of the Faithful. Secondly, Of this Infallibility of Biſhops in what they teach unanimouſly, he ſaith three things. 1. That ſome Catholicks deny it. 2. That neither part ſeems certain to him. 3. That it is probable. All which ſingly prove, That he thought it not to be of Faith. But who can imagine ſo great a Doctor could be ignorant of what was of Faith?

Theoph. Raynaudus differed not much from the Opinion of *Suarez*: *That the viſible Head,* ſaith he [3], *being laid aſide, all the Members ſhould be infected with any material error, could ſcarce happen; and it is moſt probable God will take care it ſhould not. Yet if it ſhould happen, the Head being uninfected, the perpetuity of true Faith in the Church would ſuffer no loſs:* Where he determines not abſolutely this cannot happen; but looks upon the contrary only as moſt probable; and denieth the Infallibility of the whole Church to depend thereon, which is ſo much urged by the maintainers of the contrary Opinion. *Rhodius* ſpeaks more plainly, who affirms [4], That *the Pope being dead, the Church hath no Infallible Authority to make Decrees of Faith, as having no actual and immediate Infallibility at that time.*

[3] *Ut, ſepoſito capite viſibili, membra omnia poſſint infici aliquo errore materiali, vix poteſt contingere; & veriſimillimum eſt Deo ſemper cordi futurum ne id accidat. Si tamen accideret, incontaminato capite, nihil decederet de perpetuitate veræ fidei in Eccleſiâ.* Rayn. αὐτὸς ἔφα punct. 5.

[4] *Mortuo pontifice, non eſt in Eccleſiâ ulla infallibilis authoritas ad condenda fidei Decreta.— Nullam eo tempore infallibilitatem actualem & proximam habet Eccleſia.* Rhod. de fide qu. 2. Sect. 5. §. 5.

Hence

Hence is manifeſt, that we want little of a Confeſſion from our Adverſaries, that the Infallibility of the Governours of the Church is not of Faith. And indeed it cannot be. For no Foundation of ſuch a Faith is to be found: Not Scripture or Tradition. For not to ſay, that theſe, to make any Article become of Faith, ought, according to our Adverſaries, moſt evidently to contain it; which evidence even they will not deny to be here wanting: It would be moſt abſurd, that Papiſts ſhould believe this Infallibility of the Paſtors of the Church for the Authority of Scripture and Tradition; when they believe neither of theſe, but for the Authority of the Paſtors. Take away their Teſtimony, and they will deny it to be known whether Scripture or Tradition be the word of God, or what is the ſence of either. The ſame may be ſaid of the Decrees of the Church Repreſentative. For beſides that no ſuch expreſs Decree of it can be produced, the Infallibility of the Repreſentative Church it ſelf is believed by every ſingle Papiſt, only becauſe they hear it taught by their Paſtors. As for the belief of the Univerſal Church, that ought not be produced. For that is the thing now inquired, why the Univerſal Church believeth ſo?

Will our Adverſaries therefore ſay, they believe their Paſtors cannot err in teaching unanimouſly what is of Faith; becauſe they ſo teach themſelves? This they muſt recurr to; for they have no other reaſon left of believing ſo: Yet nothing can be more abſurd. For firſt, it is the conſtant Opinion of all Mankind, and a received Law among all Nations, that none ſhould be Witneſs or Judge in his own Cauſe. Secondly, As we believe not any Man to be true and honeſt, till we be aſſured of his veracity and honeſty from ſome other Teſtimony than his own: So it would be the higheſt imprudence to eſteem thoſe Infallible, who challenge that privilege to themſelves; until their Infallibility be known to us from ſome other Argument than their own Teſtimony. Certainly our Adverſaries will not permit even the Scripture, which is the word of God, and hath ſo many illuſtrious Characters of a Divine Original, to be believed for its own Teſtimony; and Chriſt openly profeſſed, that if he bore Witneſs of himſelf, his Witneſs was not credible. Why then ſhall that be attributed to the Governours of the Church; which Chriſt denied to himſelf, and our

Adverſaries

Adversaries deny to the Word of God? Thirdly, The Question will return, whence the Pastors of the Church know that they cannot err? For they will not say, they know it because the Faithful believe it; since as *Hallier* [5] well saith, *The Pastors do not therefore teach truly, because the Auditors believe truly; but the Auditors believe truly, because they assent to the Pastors teaching truly.* They cannot say, that they know it from Scripture or Tradition. For the truth of these, without the Authority of the Church is no more known to learned than to unlearned persons. *Think not*, saith *Bagotius* [6], *that any one, even the most learned Divine, can believe any thing without the Authority of the Church, and independently from it.* And *Hosius* [7] goeth so far, that he maintains it to be the best way, that even the most learned Men should recurr to implicit Faith, and believe only in general as the Church believeth. Shall the Pastors therefore believe, that they cannot err for their own Testimony? This is the natural consequence of our Adversaries Doctrine, and that most absurd. For first, there is none of the Pastors which believeth so, because he teacheth so; but all teach so, because all believe so. Again, The Question will recurr upon what Foundation do they teach so? Here either nothing, or only this must be answered, That they teach so because they believe so. Then if you ask why they believe so? no other answer can be given, than because they believe so; which is so foolish, as that I need not urge it any farther.

[5] *Non ideo vera docent Pastores, quia vera credunt Auditores; sed ideo vera credunt Auditores, quia vera docentibus assentiuntur.* F. Hallier de Hierarch. l. 4. c. 2.

[6] *Cave existimes unumquenquam, etiam Theologum Doctissimum, posse quicquam credere sine authoritate Ecclesiæ & independenter abeâ.* Bagot. Instit. Theol. l. 4. c. 1. §. 1.

[7] Hos. cont. Brent.

CHAP. XXIV.

That the Faith of all single Christians cannot rely upon the Faith of the Universal Church; because, first, it appears not who belong to that Church, which is thought Infallible.

THus far have we considered the Faith of the Universal Church, as it is taught by the Pastors or Clergy. It remains that we treat of it as it is believed both by Clergy and Laity; which is the last refuge of our Adversaries. Here I undertake to prove, That there is nothing whereon the Faith of all private Christians can less rely; and that for three reasons. 1. Because it doth not appear what is that Universal Church,

Church, whose Faith is to be the Rule of ours. 2. Because it is not known what is the Faith of that Church. 3. Because it is not manifest whether the Faith of any Church assignable, be true.

The first is evinced two ways. For first, it is uncertain what is the true Idea or Definition of the Church, what is required to constitute it, whether only an external profession of the true Faith, or also internal Faith and Piety: And then although this were certain, it would be yet unknown, whether the *Roman*, *Greek*, or any other, were that true Church. As for the first, our Adversaries would perswade us, That they agree in the notion of a true Church. Yet nothing is more manifest than their discord in this matter. There are chiefly three Opinions of them herein: For if we should make an exact enumeration of them, we should find many more. The first teacheth, That the Church is made up of all persons baptized, and outwardly professing the true Faith, and adhering to the Pope of *Rome*, whether they be truly Faithful, or secretly Infidels. The second to an External Profession, requires Internal Faith, at least in form, to be added as necessary; and thereby excludes all secret Infidels and Hereticks. The third requireth Charity to be added to these two, and leaveth no place in the Church, but to those who are truly just, and free from Mortal Sin.

The first Opinion is defended by many, particularly *Canus*, *Bellarmin*, *Duvall*, and almost all the later writers of Controversy, especially the *French*. The second is taught by many: For all those seem to favour it, who define the Church to be the Congregation of the Faithful; of whom *Launoy* [1] reckons up a very great number. But it is openly and manifestly taught by *Alensis*, *Clemangis*, *Turrecremata*, and *Jacobatius*; while in the places formerly cited they assert, That the Church may be reduced to one only Woman, as it actually was at the time of our Saviour's Passion. The University of *Cracow* produced by *Launoy* [2], defined [3] the Church to be *a Mystical, Organical Body, animated by the Faith of Christ, constituted by all baptized persons, having the Faith of Christ either in form or formal.* The same Opinion is accurately

[1] Laun. Epist. Tom. 8. ad Gattin.

[2] *Ubi supra.*

[3] *Est Ecclesia Corpus mysticum, organicum, fide Christi animatum,— Ex quo fit quod omnes baptizati, habentes fidem Christi sive informem sive formatam, constituunt Ecclesiam militantem.*

rately and largely defended by *Suarez* [4], *Arriaga* [5], and *Caſpenſis* [6] among the Moderns.

The third Opinion ſeemeth to be favoured by *Bannes* [7], while he ſaith, *The Catechumens ſimply belong to the Inviſible Church, as being members of Chriſt through Charity; but to the Viſible Church only in part*, viz. *in wiſh and deſire.* But he inclineth more to the ſecond, in theſe words [8], *The Church, although it be a viſible Commonwealth, requireth ſomewhat inviſible, to wit, Faith. Heretick⁊ therefore, as wanting that, are out of the Church.* And in another place [9], *The Faithful which are Sinners, are truly parts of the Church Militant.* But to omit *Bannes*, the third Opinion is openly maintained by *Hugo à Sancto Victore*, whoſe words are theſe [10]: *The Church hath Stones, to wit, the Faithful, who as one Stone is joined to another by Cement, are joined to the Church by Charity.* And in another place [11], *The Holy Church is the Body of Chriſt, quickned by one Spirit, and united by one Faith, and ſanctified. This word therefore ſignifieth the Members of Chriſt partaking of the Spirit of Chriſt.* *Antoninus* of *Florence*, after he had ſaid, The Church is ſometimes taken for the General Collection of the Faithful, ſubjoins theſe words [12], *In the ſecond place the Church is taken for the Congregation of Good Believers, who are incorporated into Chriſt by Charity. This is that Church which is governed by the Holy Ghoſt, the Myſtical Body of Chriſt, which is animated by his Spirit, for which Chriſt prayed, that her Faith ſhould not fail.* The ſame faith *Cuſanus* [13], *It is manifeſt that this Body of the Church, which is thus diſpoſed* (which adhereth to Chriſt in Spirit, in which the Spirit dwells, quickning the whole Body) *is made up only of Predeſtinate Perſons. Only thoſe perſons therefore, who continue in the Grace of preſent Righteouſneſs are accounted to be of the Church.* Dionyſius

[4] Suar. de fide diſp. 9. Sect. 2.
[5] Arr. de fide diſp. 7. Sect. 2.
[6] Caſp. de fide diſp. 2. Sect. 2. 9.

[7] *Catechumeni ſimpliciter pertinent ad Eccleſiam inviſibilem; ſiquidem ſunt membra Chriſti per Charitatem; ſed ad Eccleſiam viſibilem ſecundùm quid*, viz. *per votum & deſiderium.* Bann. in 2. 2. qu. 1. art. 10. p. 47.

[8] *Eccleſia licèt ſit Reſpublica quædam viſibilis, requirit tamen aliquid inviſibile, ſc. fidem. Hæretici ergo extra eam ſunt, cùm fidem non habeant.* Id. comm. ſuſ. in art. 10. p. 90.

[9] *Fideles peccatores ſunt verè partes Eccleſiæ militantis.* Id. Comm. brev. p. 47.

[10] *Eccleſia habet lapides, ſc. fideles; qui ſicut per cæmentum lapis jungitur lapidi, ſic per charitatem junguntur ſibi.* Hug. lib. C. Serm. Serm. 3.

[11] *Eccleſia ſancta corpus eſt Chriſti uno ſpiritu vivificata, & unita fide unâ, & ſanctificata. —— Hoc itaque nomen ſignificat membra Chriſti participantia Spiritum Chriſti.* Id. de Sacr. part. 2. cap. 2.

[12] *Secundo modo ſumitur Eccleſia pro congregatione bonorum fidelium, qui ſunt per charitatem Chriſto incorporati. Hæc eſt Eccleſia, quæ regitur à Sp. S. corpus Chriſti myſticum, quod vegetatur ſpiritu ejus, pro quâ Chriſtus oravit, ne fides deficeret.* Ant. Summ. Theol. part. 3. tit. 12. c. 1.

[13] *Manifeſtum eſt hoc corpus Eccleſiæ, quod ita ſe habuit, ex prædeſtinatis tantùm conſtitui — Exiſtentes in gratiâ præſentis juſtitiæ ſolum de Eccleſiâ eſſe cenſentur.* Cuſ. Concord. lib. 1. cap. 4.

nyſius Carthuſianus [14] brings in Chriſt thus ſpeaking. *I will build and confirm my Church, that is, the Congregation of the Faithful, by inſeparably uniting their hearts to me by Faith, Charity, and Grace; ſo as all may be one myſtical Body, and one Houſe.* *J. Fr. Picus Mirandula* [15] ſaith, That *we ought not to recede from the proper ſignification of the Word; that ſo that might be called primarily, properly, and moſt principally the Holy Catholick Church, which comprehendeth all men of a right and Apoſtolick Faith and unfeigned Charity.* *Ferus* upon thoſe words, *Matth.* XV. *The gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*, ſaith [16], *Chriſt ſpeaks not here of the Church as it is commonly underſtood of the Collection of all Chriſtians, whether good or bad, but of the Church according to the Spirit, which comprehends only the Elect.* Laſtly, *Chr. Lupus* [17] affirms, That *the Church which received the Keys, is not the univerſal Communion of the Faithful in the Lawful Sacraments, but the ſole Congregation of the juſt, or the Communion of Saints:* Which he purſueth at large, and proveth by many Teſtimonies of St. *Auguſtine*; to which we might add many others no leſs cogent of other Fathers; as St. *Hierom*, *Agobardus*, *Bernard*, &c. if our Argument conſiſted in the truth of this Opinion. It ſufficeth to ſhew it was received by many; and conſequently that our Adverſaries do not agree in forming the Idea of a Church.

Now this Diſſenſion is of great moment. For if the ſecond, or eſpecially the third Opinion be true, the Doctrine of our Adverſaries will be wholly overthrown. For not to ſay, that if Sinners be excluded out of the Church, the Pope and whole Councils may perhaps not belong to it, and ſo want that Infallibility which is appropriated to the true Church. To omit this, ſince we treat not now of active but paſſive Infallibilty, I ſay, That according to this Hypotheſis, the Faith of our Adverſaries cannot rely upon the belief of the Univerſal Church. For to conform themſelves to this Rule of Faith, they muſt firſt perfectly know it; which cannot be, if they know not what is that Church, whoſe Faith they ought to follow. But how ſhall they know the Church, if that conſiſt only of Pious Men, whom none will deny to be known to God alone? *Canus* was not ignorant

[14] *Ædificabo & confirmabo Eccleſiam meam, id eſt, congregationem fidelium, corda eorum per fidem, charitatem & gratiam mihi inſeparabiliter connectendo; ita ut omnes ſint unum corpus myſticum, unaque domus.* Carth. in Matth. XVI. art. 26.

[15] *A propriâ vocabuli ſignificatione recedendum ipſe non putarem; ut primò & propriè principaliſſimèque Sancta Catholica Eccleſia diceretur, quæ omnes rectæ & Apoſtolicæ fidei & non fictæ charitatis homines complecteretur.* Pic. Theor. 13.

[16] *Sed loquitur de Eccleſiâ ſecundùm ſpiritum, quæ ſolos electos complectitur.* Fer. in Matth.

[17] *Eccleſia quæ claves accepit, non eſt univerſa fidelium in legitimis Sacramentis communio, ſed ſola congregatio juſtorum, ſeu Sanctorum communio.* Lup. in Concil. tom. 4. p. 818.

norant of this; who rejecteth this Opinion, because, saith he [18], *all things will be uncertain, if the Church be limited to pious Men.* Will our Adversaries therefore say, that the first of these Opinions is certain, the other undoubtedly false? That is easier affirmed than proved. Besides, of what degree of certainty would they have their assertions to be? Not certainly of Divine Faith; unless Heresie be imputed to all those Learned Men, who maintained the second and third Opinions. But no other degree of certainty can be obtained in these things, nor will any other suffice.

[18] *Incerta erunt omnia, si apud solos pios Ecclesia est.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 4. cap. 3.

CHAP. XXV.

That our Adversaries have no way of knowing the true Church.

IT doth not appear therefore, who they are that truly belong to the Church. Yet suppose it is, and that all Baptized Persons outwardly professing the true Faith, are Members of it; which Opinion most pleaseth our Adversaries, and is most advantageous for them. It is still to be enquired, which, out of so many Societies that challenge to themselves the name of the Church, justly and truly claims it. For not any one that first occurrs, is to be admitted and preferred before the rest. But here, if any where, a diligent and accurate Examination is to be used; lest instead of the Church of Christ, we follow the Synagogue of Satan; and for Divine Revelations receive execrable Errors. This especially becomes them, who when they have found the Church, give over any further enquiry, and receive without Examination all the dictates of it. They ought to be very vigilant and curious in the choice of their Guide; lest if they haply mistake, they incurr that Sentence of Christ, *If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch.* Let us see therefore whether our Adversaries can boast they have made a just and accurate enquiry herein, and most certainly found out the true Church.

There are chiefly three Methods of making this Enquiry. 1. From the truth of the Doctrine professed by any Church, and

and Conformity of that to the Word of God. 2. By Notes known only by the light of right Reaſon, and independently from the Word of God. 3. By Notes which are marked out and taught in the Scripture. *Arriaga* preferreth the firſt Method before all others. *I anſwer*, ſaith he [1], *that the truth of the Doctrine may be proved without recurring to the Church; yea, and that before the firſt Proof of the true Church, the truth of the Doctrine ought to be proved.* He proveth both parts of his Aſſertion largely, and in the ſecond part of it maketh uſe of this Argument. *For ſince the Church, as a Church, is defined the Congregation of men profeſſing the true Doctrine of Faith, it is a contradiction in the very terms, to ſuppoſe any Congregation to be the true Church, unleſs I do for that very reaſon ſuppoſe there is the true Doctrine.* I cannot therefore firſt prove the Doctrine is true from the truth of the Church. To this we willingly ſubſcribe, and approve this Method of *Arriaga*'s only. Not ſo the reſt of our Adverſaries, who deteſt it, and labour to render it both infamous and impoſſible; pretending it to be full of inextricable difficulties, and not to be ſurmounted by the moſt learned, much leſs by illiterate perſons. Wherefore I need not endeavour to prove that the true Church cannot be by this way known by our Adverſaries: They freely grant it, urge it, and labour to demonſtrate it.

[1] *Reſpondeo veritatem doctrinæ probari etiam poſſe, non recurrendo ad Eccleſiam, imò ante primam probationem veræ Eccleſiæ debere probari veritatem doctrinæ. — Etenim cum Eccleſia, ut Eccleſia, definiatur per hoc, quòd ſit cœtus profitentium veram doctrinam fidei, repugnat in terminis me ſupponere aliquam congregationem eſſe veram Eccleſiam; niſi dicam eo ipſo ibi eſſe veram doctrinam. Ergo non poſſum primò probare veram doctrinam ex veræ Eccleſiæ.* Arr. de fide diſp. 7. Sect. 5.

The ſecond Method is uſed by many; who contend that the Church may be known independently from the Word of God by the help of Notes and Characters perceived by Natural Reaſon, ſuch as are Miracles, Sanctity, Antiquity, Amplitude, and the like. But they withal admoniſh that the Church cannot this way be known, as it hath annexed to it the Privilege of Infallibility by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, and conſequently as it is the certain Rule of Faith. They deny this can be any other way found out than by Faith relying on the Promiſes of Chriſt and the other teſtimonies of Scripture. But that the Authority, which theſe Notes conferr, is Humane, Fallible, and a Foundation only of humane and acquired, not of

divine and infused Faith. So among infinite others teach *Canus* [2], *Bannes* [3], *Suarez* [4], *Duvall* [5], *Conink* [6], *Arriaga* [7], *Tſambertus* [8], *Gillius* [9], *Amicus* [10], and *Rhodius* [11]: The laſt of theſe affirms, *there is a two-fold Authority of the Church; the one purely Humane, as it is proved by Miracles, Prophecies, and ſuch like; the other Divine, as it is Infallible by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. Neither can be the formal Object of Faith. Not the firſt; for then it would follow that Faith were Natural, Fallible,* &c. Certainly it is abſurd to imagine that the Church of Chriſt, redeemed and governed by him, and animated by his Spirit, can be known by the ſole light of Nature without Revelation. Nature might diſcover ſomewhat admirable and excellent in it; but nothing more than humane, or exalted beyond humane infirmities. But this is not that we ſeek for. We are enquiring a Method of knowing the Church as it is the Rule of Faith, and Infallible: which ſince this Method cannot perform, it cannot be produced in this place.

[2] Loc. Theol. l. 2. c. 8. [3] In 2.2. qu. 1. art. 1. dub. 4. [4] De fide diſp. 3. Sect. 10. [5] In 2. 2. p. 10. [6] De actib. ſup. diſp. 17. n. 68. [7] De fide diſp. 3. Sect. 1. [8] De fide diſp. 26 art. 2. [9] De doctr. ſacrâ l. 1. tract. 7. c. 9. [10] De fide diſp. 2. Sect. 5. [11] *Duplex eſt authoritas Eccleſiæ, alia eſt purè humana, prout ſc. eam probant miracula, prophetiæ, & alia hujuſmodi: alia eſt divina, prout ex aſſiſtentiâ Sp. S. eſt infallibilis. Neutra poteſt eſſe objectum formale fidei. Non prima, ſequeretur enim fidem eſſe naturalem, eſſe fallibilem, &c.* Rhod. de fide qu. 1. Sect. 4. §. 4.

For theſe Reaſons our Adverſaries fly to the third Method; and endeavour to demonſtrate the Church from Notes, which they pretend to be aſſigned in Scripture. So *Driedo* [12] from hence, that Chriſt is not now preſent, nor teacheth with his own mouth in the Church, nor atteſteth the Preaching of others with Signs and Miracles, concludes, *We muſt neceſſarily flee to the Scriptures, and enquire thence which is the true Church.* Stapleton [13]: *We ſay therefore, and willingly acknowledge with St.* Auguſtine, *that the Church is to be ſought for in the Scripture; that is, what are the Notes, Privileges, and Properties of the Church, is to be found out from the Oracles of Holy Scripture, not from Humane Arguments.* The ſame ſay the Popiſh Diſputants in the Conference of *Ratiſbon* [14]. *We know the Chriſtian Religion only from the Scriptures; becauſe from the Notes only declared in Scripture, and from no others, we know which is the true Church.* This way alſo Card. *Richlieu* [15] chiefly follows.

[12] *De Eccl. dogm.* l. 2. c. 3. l. 4. c. 4.

[13] *Dicimus ergo, & libentiſſimè dicimus cum Auguſtino in Scripturis quærendam eſſe Eccleſiam,* i. e. *quæ ſint notæ, dotes & proprietates Eccleſiæ ex S. Scripturæ oraculis, non ex humanis documentis inveſtigandum eſſe.* De princip. doctr. lib. 1. cap. 24.

[14] *Tantummodo igitur ex Scripturis Religionem Chriſtianam cognoſcimus; quia tantummodo ex notis in Scripturâ declaratis, & non ex aliis cognoſcimus, quæ ſit vera Eccleſia.* Colloq. Ratiſb. Seſſ. 8.

[15] *Meth. liv. 1. Chap. 8.*

But

But there are many things inconſiſtent to be found in it: As firſt, that it ſuppoſeth the Scripture to be acknowledged for the Word of God. For no man can believe the Notes of the Church laid down in the Scripture to be true and certain, till he be firſt perſwaded that all things contained in it are true and Divine. But how ſhall he, who hath not yet known the Church (for ſuch is he who enquires after it) be aſſured of the Divinity of Scripture, if it be true what our Adverſaries ſo often inculcate, That the Scripture to us is of no Authority, till atteſted and confirmed by the Church? Thus a manifeſt Circle will be committed, Scripture received for the Authority of the Church, and the Church for the Authority of Scripture. Card. *Richlieu* confeſſeth this a great difficulty; but contendeth it may be ſolved by ſaying, The Church is known independently from the Scripture by the help of Notes, which Natural Reaſon ſuggeſteth can agree to none but the true Church. But if the Church can be known before the Scripture, what need the Scripture be conſulted to find Notes whereby we may be brought to the knowledge of the Church? To what end theſe Labyrinths and fruitleſs toil to ſearch out a thing already known? Not to ſay, that this Method is coincident with the ſecond before mentioned, and is therefore for the ſame reaſons to be rejected. Beſides it manifeſtly contradicts our Adverſaries Hypotheſis concerning the obſcurity of Scripture. Every one knows how much they exaggerate this obſcurity, and *Richlieu* himſelf, within a few pages of this place, maintains it is obſcure, both as to the ſenſe, and as to the letter; and that not only to the Reprobate, but even the Elect; to the Faithful and Doctors themſelves. Who after all this can believe that he ſpeaks ſincerely and in earneſt, when he undertakes to demonſtrate out of this Book, ſo obſcure and impenetrable to the greateſt Wits, the Characters of the true Church, not to a Doctor or a Believer, but to an Infidel: For this he pretends, about his Converſion is the Diſpute raiſed.

The Cardinal therefore in that undertakes a moſt difficult matter. But the obſcurity of Scripture is not all the difficulty of this undertaking. For how ſhall it be demonſtrated thoſe things are by Scripture aſſigned for the Notes of the Church, of which Scripture is wholly ſilent, nay, teacheth the contrary to ſome of them; as might be evidently proved, if the intended

brevity

brevity of this Dissertation would permit it? But suppose the Scripture attributes to the Church whatsoever our Adversaries would have to be so many Notes of it: This avails not, unless it appear that those Notes are not only true, but also the only Notes, and that no other is assigned in Scripture. This the Cardinal himself admonisheth. *It is to be observed*, saith he[16], *that although it doth not follow that Society which hath one of the Notes of the true Church, is the true Church; yet it follows, that Society which wanteth one of these Notes, is not the true Church.* *Valentia* had gone before him. *These are the Notes*, saith he[17], *which we urge, One, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick. These are not the Notes of the Church singly, but conjunctly; because it may be that one or two of them may agree to others.* And indeed it cannot be denied that the *Greek* Church hath many of these Notes. If therefore from one or more of them we might argue affirmatively, the *Greek* must be granted to be a true Church.

[16] *Method. liv. 1. chap.*

[17] *Non sunt notæ Ecclesiæ sigillatim sed conjunctim, quia fieri possit ut una harum & altera alibi conveniat.* Val. Anal. fid. lib. 6. cap. 7.

To conclude therefore that the *Roman*, or any other, is the true Church, it is necessary that no note of the true Church be wanting to it, and that it be evident no other note is assigned in Scripture besides those wherein she already glorieth. While this is uncertain, nothing can be securely concluded from any Notes whatever. That an Infidel therefore be rightly instructed, it is required, that he read over the whole Scripture from one end to the other, accurately weigh and examine all places, that he may be ascertained none of those Notes have escaped his diligence. But this besides, that it is long and tedious, and apt rather to discourage and deterr than allure an Infidel to the Christian Religion, is impossible, if our Adversaries Doctrine of the obscurity of Scripture be admitted. For who can promise himself that nothing hath escaped his most sagacious enquiry, amidst so much darkness and intricacy, as our Adversaries pretend to be in Scripture? Much less can an Infidel be assured of this, whose Understanding is yet clouded with Errors, and his Eyes with Blindness. Yet if he be not certain that no one Note of the Church is unknown to him, how many soever he hath by his search observed, in vain doth he sweat: since even, according to our Adversaries, many Notes contribute nothing to that Society, to which any one is wanting. And this is so much the more difficult, because our Adversaries are not agreed about the number of the Notes. *Valentia* and many others assign

aſſign four, *Driedo* ſix, *Medina* ten, *Sanders* and *Piſtorius* twelve, *Bellarmin* fifteen, *Boſius* an hundred. In ſo great variety of opinions what certainty can be expected?

But what if in this diligent reading of Scripture many things ſhall occurr, whereby the Catechumen will be induced to believe there are many other Notes beſide thoſe which our Adverſaries point out, and thoſe ſuch as will divert him from embracing the Communion of the Church of *Rome?* He will in the firſt place obſerve thoſe words of Chriſt. [18] *If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my Diſciples indeed. He that is of God, heareth God's words. My Sheep hear my voice.* Hence he will conclude that the truth of Doctrine, and its conformity to God's word, is the moſt certain Note of the true Church. But our Adverſaries will never permit, that he ſhould make uſe of this Note to find out the Church. For that would introduce the firſt method ſo much hated by them: and it were to be feared, that the Catechumen comparing the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* with the Scripture, would find a manifeſt repugnance in many things. Another Note of the Church he would find to be the obſervation of the Divine Precepts from the ſame places. For he cannot be ſaid to hear the voice of Chriſt, that obeys it not. And in other places Chriſt ſaith: [19] *If ye keep my commandments, ye ſhall abide in my Love. Ye are my friends if ye do whatſoever I command you.* God alſo foretold by his Prophets that under the new Covenant he would write his Laws in the hearts of Men, and make them to walk in his ſtatutes. But can the Catechumen find this obſervation of the Divine precepts in the Church of *Rome*, where the Cup is taken from the Laity, Prayers performed in an Unknown Tongue, and many other things uſed expreſly contrary to the Divine Commands?

[18] John VIII. 31, 47. X. 27.

[19] John VIII. 10, 14.

The Scripture oft-times calls the Church the moſt chaſt Spouſe of Chriſt. Now this Chaſtity conſiſts in keeping her Faith to God, and transferring no part of the Divine Worſhip due to him upon any other objects. Otherwiſe God will implead her of adultery, and give her a bill of divorcement. Will the Catechumen then from this Note conclude the Church of *Rome* to be the Spouſe of Chriſt; by whom he perceiveth ſo many Creatures, Saints deceaſed, their Reliques, the Croſs, Images, and the Hoſt, to be worſhipped and adored? Meekneſs and Gentleneſs is alſo a note of the Church, when her Children are frequently

quently in the Scriptures called *Sheep*, *Lambs*, *Doves*, *Turtles*. *Isaiah* foretold all cruelty ſhould be far from the Church of
[19] Iſai. XI. 9. & LXIII. 25. Chriſt. [20] *They ſhall not hurt nor deſtroy in all my Holy Mountain.* Chriſt left his Peace to his Diſciples, and ſaid to them: [21] *Learn*
[21] Matth. XI. 29. *of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye ſhall find reſt unto your Souls.* Who can then imagine the Church of Chriſt to be that Society, which perſecutes all diſſenting from her with fire and ſword, and ſcarce uſeth any other arguments than Racks and Gibbets? Of the ſame nature, with this Note is another laid down by *Da-*
[22] Pſ. CX. 3. *vid.* He calls [22] the Church *a willing People*: who are not retained in the Communion of their Saviour by force and fear, but by a moſt free and that moſt fervent Love. Hence her moſt excellent
[23] Zach. XI. 7. Paſtor is ſaid [23] to govern her with *two ſtaves, one called Beauty, and the other Bands*: but that you may not miſtake, thoſe
[1] Hoſ. XI. 4. bands are [1] *the cords of a Man, and the bands of Love.* Is *Rome* therefore this Church of Chriſt, which whereſoever ſhe commands, hath no ſtronger bands to retain her People than the deteſtable Tribunal of the Holy Inquiſition? To theſe two laſt Notes is conjoined a ſixth: That ſhe be free, and not a Servant of Men, eſpecially of Paſtors. This the Scripture teacheth in many places, particularly, *Gal.* IV. 25, 26. *John* VIII. 32. 36. 2 *Cor.* I. 24. III. 17. IV. 5. 1 *Pet.* V. 3. *Ja.* I. 25. That therefore is not the Church of Chriſt, which ſerveth the Pope, whoſe Slave *Cajetan* expreſly calls her. Is that Church free, upon which the Pope impoſeth arbitrary Laws, which none muſt call in queſtion? Can he be denied to be Lord of the Church,
[1] Decret part. 1. diſt. 40. can. *Si Papa.* who as the Canon Law [1] tells us, *although he ſhould carry innumerable People by troops as Slaves to Hell, to be with himſelf for ever tormented; yet no mortal muſt preſume to reprehend his faults, becauſe he is to judge all, to be judged of none?* Who, not to mention obſolete Stories, but lately commanded all to believe, there is five heretical propoſitions in *Janſenius*; and yet, although humbly intreated by many Doctors, would not declare in what part of *Janſenius* his Book they might be found? What is this but to account Chriſtians as moſt vile Slaves?
[3] John IV. 23. The ſeventh Note of the Church conſiſts in this, [3] That ſhe worſhip God in Spirit and in Truth. The ancient Church of the Jews indeed uſed a groſs and ſenſible kind of Worſhip, and was employed about the mean and beggerly Elements of the World: but it is the peculiar glory of the Chriſtian Church, to wor-

ſhip

ſhip God in a way moſt conſentaneous to the ſimplicity of his being and the holineſs of his nature. Not ſo the Church of *Rome*, which obſerveth ſo many diverſe and difficult ceremonies; that in compariſon of them the Moſaick Rites are both few and eaſy. This you will ſoon acknowledge, if you compare the fourth or at moſt the third part of the Pentateuch (for no more is taken up with ritual matters) with ſo many vaſt volumes, the Ceremonial, Pontifical, Ritual, Miſſal, Gradual, and others; which preſcribe the external part of the Roman Service. Laſtly, the true Church is that which neither uſurpeth nor diſturbeth the civil Goverment. Therein imitating Chriſt her Maſter; who offered heavenly things to all, earthly to none; profeſſed his Kingdom was not of this World; withdrew himſelf unto the Mountains, when ſought for by the multitude to be made a King; and refuſed to be a Judge in a matter of inheritance. The true Church obſerveth the Apoſtles precept [4] of being *ſubject to the higher Powers*: And that other [5] of *rendering to all their due, tribute to whom tribute, cuſtom to whom cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour*. Not ſo the Church of *Rome*, whoſe Head, the Pope, depoſeth Kings at his pleaſure, abſolveth their Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance, and pretends to a Sovereign Dominion over the whole World. I might produce many other like Notes of the Church out of Scripture; but theſe ſuffice to ſhew how great danger they expoſe the Church of *Rome* to, who out of thoſe Holy Writings permit a judgment to be formed of her Truth and Purity.

[4] Rom. XIII. 1.

[5] Ibid. v. 7.

I will now proceed briefly to demonſtrate that not even from thoſe Notes which the Church of *Rome* aſſigns, can it be known that ſhe is the true Church. Card. *Richlieu* aſſigns four, Antiquity, Amplitude, Perpetuity, and Succeſſion. Amplitude ſhall be conſidered afterwards; the other three I will now briefly touch. Antiquity conſiſts ſolely or chiefly in this, that the Church which is called Ancient, have preſerved the ſame Faith, Worſhip, and Religion from the beginning. While the Church of *Rome* therefore glorieth in Antiquity, ſhe meaneth that ſhe now profeſſeth the ſame Faith which Chriſt formerly inſtituted, and his Apoſtles taught. But to know this there is no other way than to compare the preſent Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* with the Ancient Monuments of Chriſtian Religion,

of which Scripture is the Chief. Now this in nothing differeth from the first method, which we only approve, and our Adversaries reject. If then the Church cannot be known by that method, neither can it by that which our Adversaries propose. The discussion of perpetuity is yet more difficult. For therein is to be proved not only that the present is the same with the first and original Doctrine, but also that it was so in every Age, and that this profession of the old Religion was never once interrupted. Now how vast and unexhausted a knowledge of antiquity doth this require? No ancient monument must be neglected; infinite Volumes both Printed and Manuscript must be read through. This few Men can attend to; or if they could, one Age would not suffice. Yet this accordding to *Richlieu's* method must be done by any Infidel who is a Candidate of Christianity. The same may be said of Succession. That is twofold, of Doctrine, and of Persons. The first is coincident with antiquity and perpetuity: the second in *Gretser's* judgment is of little moment. *Without Truth of Doctrine*, saith he, [6] *Succession of Pastors is of small weight*. But suppose it of the greatest moment. What is more laborious and difficult, to say no more, than to prove that in a long series of Succession continued through XVI. Ages there never happened the least interruption.

[6] *Sine veritate doctrinæ successio Pastorum est exigui ponderis.* De verb. Dei lib. 4. cap. 9.

Thus much of the Notes singly. As for all taken together, it is manifest that even in our Adversaries opinion they cannot be certain; since they are found in the Greek Church. The Cardinal denies that of Antiquity, because the Church of *Constantinople* cannot demonstrate her claim of being founded by St. *Andrew*. Let it be. Certainly the Churches of *Hierusalem*, *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, and *Athens*, which are parts of the Greek Church, were founded by Apostles, and the first even by Christ himself. Again the Cardinal denieth the Succession of the Greek Bishops; because their Patriarchs were heretical. But first, it matters not what the Patriarchs are, if the other Bishops be Orthodox. Secondly, this very thing may be brought against the Succession of Popes: for some of them have been condemned by General Councils. Lastly, if heresie interrupts succession; it will be no more certain that the Succession of Popes was never interrupted, than that no Pope was ever an Heretick. But how shall this be ascertained, especially to an Infidel

fidel, of whom we now treat, who may conſider that many in the Church of *Rome* openly teach the contrary? To this may be added, That it is abſurd in this caſe to pretend Hereſy againſt the Succeſſion of any Church. For that is the very thing now inquired by this Infidel, which Society of Chriſtians is the true Church, and conſequently, which of them are Hereticks or Schiſmaticks? This method therefore, can never certainly teach us, That the Church of *Rome* is the true Church.

CHAP. XXVI.

That it is uncertain, what the Univerſal Church believeth.

IF after all this we ſhould grant, That our Adverſaries may certainly know which is the true Church; it were yet to be inquired what this Church believeth. But how ſhall this be known? For firſt it doth not ſuffice to know what the greater or leſſer part of the Univerſal Church believeth, unleſs we know what is the Faith of the whole. For our Adverſaries confeſs, That the greater part of it may erre. So *Toſtatus* anſwering to thoſe, who from the Univerſal corruption of the tranſlations of the Bible before S. *Hierom*'s time argued, That the whole Church then erred, replyed, That *all the Copies indeed of the Latin Church were corrupted, but in the Greek Church were preſerved entire. Now,* ſaith he, [1] *the Latin Church is not the Univerſal Church, but only a part of it. Therefore, although that had wholly erred, the Univerſal Church would not have erred; becauſe it remains in thoſe parts which do not err, whether they be more or fewer in number than the parts which do err. So* Canus [2]. *Nothing hinders, but that the greater part of the Church may err.* Banes [3]. *The Opinion of the greater*

[1] *Eccleſia autem Latinorum non eſt Eccleſia Univerſalis, ſed quadam pars ejus. Ideo etiamſi tota ipſa erraſſet, non erraret Eccl. univerſalis, quia manet Eccl. univerſalis in partibus illis quæ non errant, ſive illa ſint plures numero quàm errantes, ſive non.* Toſt. in 2. Prol. Hier. in Matth. qu. 4.

[2] *At nihil obſtat, cur major Eccleſiæ pars non erret.* Can. loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 3.

[3] *Sententia majoris partis Eccleſiæ poteſt eſſe falſa in materia fidei.* Bann. in 2. 2. qu. 1. art. 10. dub. 4.

part of the Church may be false in a matter of Faith. Valentia considering those words of Christ: *When the Son of Man comes, shall he find Faith upon the Earth?* saith [4], *He signifies that there will be very few Faithful in that last time, not that there will be none.* And *Bellarmin* [5] treating of the same words, saith with *Theophylact*, That *our Lord meaneth, there will be few Faithful in the times of Antichrist; not yet that there will be none, nor so few, as not to constitute a Church.*

[4] *Significat paucissimos certè fore postremo illo tempore fideles, non autem nullos.* Val. tom. 3. disp. 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. §. 16.

[5] *Non tamen nullos, nec tam paucos, ut non faciant Ecclesiam.* Bel. de Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 16.

Many Divines, and those of great name, (whose words we before produced) have gone farther, and maintained, That the true Faith, and true Church may be reduced to one only Woman. Nor doth *John Viguerius* a *Dominican*, Professor of Divinity in the University of *Tholouse*, differ much from them, teaching that Faith, at least explicit, may be preserved in one person, all the rest retaining only implicit Faith. *It may be said of the Church*, saith he [6], *that it may be preserved in one person, as it is said of the V.* Mary, *that in her only, during the three days of burial, remained explicit Faith, touching the Divinity of Christ; although many others in* Judea *might have actual and implicit Catholick Faith, but not explicit, of the Divinity of Christ.*

[6] *Sic potest dici de Ecclesiâ, quòd potest servari in uno, prout dicitur de Mariâ Virg. quòd in eâ solâ in triduo sepulturæ mansit fides explicita de divinitate Christi; quamvis multi alii per Judæam existentes habere possent fidem catholicam actualem & implicitam, non tamen explicitam, de divinitate Christi.* Vig. Instit. Theol, c. 10.

If either of these two Opinions be allowed, we must despair of ever knowing the Faith of the Universal Church. For where can be sought for, by what Notes can be found that Phœnix, that *Deucalion* of the Christian World, who alone retains explicit Faith, when all the rest have either erred, or preserved only implicit Faith? But be these Opinions true or false; the opposite of neither of them can be of Faith, as I before proved of the former; and of the latter may be hence proved, That this Book of *Viguerius* is approved by the Faculty of Divinity of *Paris*; which would never have been done, if it had been found to contain Heresie. However, let both be exploded, the other cannot be denied, That the greater part of the Church may err. Nay further, None ever yet dared to define,

fine, how great that part of the Church muſt neceſſarily be, which cannot be infected with Error, without the ruin of the Infallibility of the whole. Unleſs therefore it appears, that the whole Church conſenteth, the belief of it cannot be a ſure Foundation for our Faith.

But firſt, the whole Church ſeldom or never conſenteth. Certainly never in all things. All things therefore can never be learned from her. Whence then ſhall they be learned? Beſides, where ſhe doth conſent, it is ſo obſcure, that it can be known by no Man. This is proved, and much more manifeſtly, by all thoſe Arguments which we brought againſt the certainty of knowing what all the Paſtors teach. For if it cannot be known what all the Paſtors teach; much leſs can it be known what all the Faithful believe; ſince there are far more Believers than Paſtors, and theſe teach more diſtinctly than the others believe. Beſide, it is not ſufficient to know what ſeemeth true to all the Faithful, unleſs it be alſo known what they all embrace as revealed by God. For our Adverſaries acknowledge there are many falſe Opinions of the whole Church. *Maldonat* [7] proveth this at large, and giveth ſome Examples of it. As, that the Church for many Ages uſed a Preface upon the Feſtival of St. *Hierom*, wherein ſhe extolled his pure Virginity, although St. *Hierom* in ſeveral places confeſſeth the contrary; for which reaſon the Preface was at laſt expunged; That for 600 years ſhe adminiſtred the Euchariſt to Infants; That ſhe worſhippeth particular Reliques of Saints, and prayeth for the Souls of particular Men in Purgatory, although it be not of Faith that thoſe Reliques are true, or theſe Souls in Purgatory, and the like; which proveth the neceſſity of knowing, not only what is held by the Univerſal Church, but whether it is held by her as of Faith, and revealed by God. But who ſhall aſcertain this? For the common ſort of Believers are not wont accurately to diſtinguiſh theſe things; ſo that if any one ſhould ask whomſoever he meets, What they admit as true, what as revealed, what they receive with Divine Faith, what with Catholick Opinion; he would find very few who could comprehend the Sence of his Queſtion; much fewer, who could anſwer him diſtinctly. So far ſhall we be therefore from knowing by this method what is believed in the Univerſal Church, that it can ſcarce be known what is believed in any ſingle Dioceſs.

[7] Apud Richer Hiſt. Concil. lib. 3. cap. 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

That it may justly be doubted, whether all those things be true, which the Universal Church believeth.

THere remains the third Reason of the impossibility of founding the Faith of all single Christians upon the belief of the Universal Church, the uncertainty of the truth of this Belief. For, suppose the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church, and that it is sufficiently known what she believeth: It is not yet manifest whether she believeth rightly. For a True Church is one thing, an Infallible Church another: Yet Infallible must that necessarily be, which is to us a certain Rule of Faith. Before all things therefore it is required to be known, that the Church is Infallible. But how shall this be known? Our Adversaries commonly say, It is known by Faith. But to this I oppose the Opinion of those Divines, who hold, That all Christians may fall from the Faith, except one single Woman. Hence I conclude, That the Infallibility of the Church cannot be of Faith, because repugnant to the Opinion of these Catholick Divines. Certainly we, who deny the Infallibility of the Church, go not so far as they. We believe that God preserveth to himself even in the most difficult times, *a remnant according to the election of Grace*: and that there always remains at least an Invisible Church, whose name being collective, cannot consist, and be restrained to one person.

Our Adversaries therefore cannot pretend their Opinion, as it is at this day proposed, to be of Faith: And so much the less, because they can assign no Foundation of this Faith. Not Scripture, Tradition, Decrees of Popes, Definitions of Councils, or Consent of Pastors. For first, I have proved in the preceding Discourse, That none of all these can be rely'd upon, at least according to our Adversaries Hypotheses; and then it is the constant Doctrine of Papists, That the Church is not believed for them, but they for the Church. Again it is certain, that the Infallibility of the Church cannot be believed

ieved for the Authority of the Church it ſelf. For that would be a manifeſt Circle; and he that doubteth whether the Church can err, doth for that very reaſon doubt whether ſhe doth not err, when ſhe thinks that ſhe cannot err. Therefore *Bannes* [1] ſaid truly, *That the Church is the Infallible rule of propoſing and explaining truths of Faith cannot be reduced to the Authority of the Church it ſelf; for that would be to prove the ſame thing by it ſelf.*

[1] *Non poteſt reduci ad authoritatem ipſius Eccleſiæ hoc enim eſſet idem per idem confirmare.* Bann. in 2. 2. qu. 1. art. 1. dub. 4.

Why then is it believed? Our Adverſaries commonly anſwer, That it is a thing before all others to be believed, and not for any other Rule; for then the ſame Queſtion would return about that Rule: And becauſe they commonly require three things to make up an Act of Faith. 1. The Teſtimony of God revealing, as the formal Reaſon and principal Foundation. 2. A Rule whereby this Revelation of God may be manifeſted. 3. Motives of Credibility which may induce us to be willing to believe; they think the firſt is here preſent, and the third abundantly to be had in the Notes of the Church, which are perceived and dictated by Natural Reaſon; but the ſecond wanting, which they pretend not to be neceſſary in a matter of firſt belief, ſuch as this is. But firſt, if a Rule be not requir'd in forming this firſt Act of Faith: Why is it neceſſary in others? Why may not all the other Articles be believed for the Authority of God by the inducement of Motives of Credibility, with which the Chriſtian Religion is abundantly furniſhed? Secondly, Which is chiefly to be regarded, it is abſurd to boaſt of a Teſtimony of God revealing, which no way can be known. The Infallibility of the Church, or any other Article of Belief can never be proved to have been revealed by God, but by ſome Rule either living or dead, whereby things revealed may be diſtinguiſhed from not revealed; otherwiſe the moſt fooliſh Opinion may intitle it ſelf to Revelation, and then cannot be rejected.

Here they fly to Motives of Credibility, and by them undertake to ſupply their defect of a Rule, and manifeſt the Revelation. But if theſe Motives can confer upon the Church ſo ſufficient an Authority, that what ſhe propoſeth as revealed by God, muſt be believed: Why may not the like Motives give the ſame Authority to the Scripture, and aſſure us of the Divine Original of it? And that ſuch Motives are not wanting

to

to the Scripture *Bellarmin* [2], *Suarez* [3], *Duvall* [4], and *Martinonius* [5] among many others expresly confess. Why may we not then by these Motives first be satisfied of the Authority of Scripture, and from thence learn all things necessary to Salvation, which are clearly contained in it; and be so saved without recurring to the Church?

Further, How is it gathered from these Notes and Motives of Credibility that the Church cannot err; whether evidently, certainly, and necessarily; or only obscurely, probably, and contingently? The first our Adversaries will never say; for then it would necessarily follow, That Faith is evident; which they all contend to be false; insomuch as *Bellarmin* [6] disputing of Miracles, the chief of these Motives, hath these words, *Before the Approbation of the Church it is not evident nor certain with the certainty of Faith of any Miracle, that it is a true one. And that it is not evident is manifest; for then Faith would be evident.* Besides, if these Notes evidently prove the Church cannot err, it would be most false, what our Adversaries before delivered with so great consent, that by these Notes the Church is not known as it hath an Infallible, but only as it hath an Humane and Fallible Authority. Lastly, They acknowledge, as we before shewed, That a manifest and convictive Argument cannot be deduced from one or more of these Notes, although fortified by the Authority of Scripture, if any one be wanting. How then will they afford evidence, when perceived by the sole light of Nature, and are much fewer? For they allow more Notes to be pointed out by Scripture, than taught by the light of Nature.

Do these Notes then only perswade probably? If so, I have gained what I was to prove. For then it will be only probable that the Church cannot err; and the Faith of Papists will have no certainty, as not exceeding probability. For whatsoever they believe, they believe either for the Testimony or for the Judgment of the Church; and so cannot be more certain, or evident than is the Infallibility of the Church in testifying and judging. Some to elude this, make a twofold evidence, *Physical* and *Moral*; and grant the Arguments of the Infallibility of the Church not to be Physically evident, but contend they are Morally. So especially *Ægidius Conink* [7]. But here in the first place, this manifest absurdity occurrs; That when they acknowledge these Arguments to be only Morally certain, they yet maintain Faith, which

1 *De verbo Dei*, lib. 1. cap. 2.
De fide disp. 5. Sect. 2, 3.
4 Duvall in 2.2. p. 120.
5 De fide disp. 7. Sect. 1.

6 *Ante approbationem Ecclesiæ non est evident aut certum certitudine fidei de ullo miraculo quòd sit verum miraculum. Et quidem quòd non sit evidens patet, quia tunc fides esset evidens.* Bell. de Eccles. l. 4. c. 14.

7 De actib. sup. disp. 2. dub. 2. num. 46. collat. cum dub. 3. num. 71, 72.

which is founded solely upon them, to be Physically certain; for that degree of certainty all attribute to Divine Faith. Besides it hence also appears, that this Moral Certainty doth not suffice; because it is more than Morally, even Physically evident, that those things are false, which the Church of *Rome* teacheth about the Eucharist: For that the Eucharist after Consecration is still Bread and Wine, is proved by innumerable Arguments of Physical Evidence, which consequently can never be counterweighed, much less outweighed by Arguments of Moral Evidence, brought to prove the Infallibility of that Church which teacheth a contrary Opinion.

However it will not be amiss to examine, whether the Arguments drawn from these Notes of the Church be morally evident, as is pretended. But first we must remove the Equivocation which lieth hid in this term. For it is used by the Schoolmen in a threefold Sence. First therefore, many call that Morally Certain, which is so probable, that many Arguments perswade it, but nothing insinuates the least suspicion of the contrary. Secondly, Those things are called Morally Certain; which to use *Bellarmin*'s words, are confirmed by so many Signs and Conjectures, as may exclude all Anxiety, but not all Distrust. Thirdly, Those things are most properly said to be morally certain, *which are known by the common and unanimous testimony of a great multitude witnessing a thing by them seen, which Testimony none contradicts*; as *Conink* [8] defines them. If our Adversaries say the Arguments taken from the Notes of the Church are morally certain in the first or second Sence; in the first place I deny it: For those things only are morally certain in those Sences, against which no contrary Arguments can be produced. For if any such occurr, the Mind fluctuates, and can obtain no certainty. Now none can deny, that there are many at least probable Arguments which perswade, That the Church of *Rome* is not the true Church. Secondly, I assert, That neither of these Certainties will suffice. For they cannot, but in a loose and improper Sence, be called Certainty. They are indeed meer probability, which may suffice in matters of Life and Action, where greater certainty cannot be had, but not in matters of Belief and Salvation, where the greatest is required; whereas these may possibly be false, as is manifest in the Cases of an Infant whether Baptized, or an Host whether Consecrated,

[8] *Quæ ex communi & concordi magnæ multitudinis rem visam testantis testimonio, cui nemo contradicit, noscuntur.* De actib. sup. disp. 11. dub. 1. num. 44.

which are commonly produced for Examples of the first and greatest of the two kinds of Moral Certainty. For both the Baptism of an Infant, and the Consecration of an Host, depending upon the Intention of the Priest, can never be certainly known to have been duly performed. For no Man can be ever speculatively certain of those things which can be false.

There remains then the third Sence; which I deny not to be sufficient, although it be not wholly consonant to the Doctrine of our Adversaries. But to pass by that, it is manifest, That here is no place for this kind of certainty; since it depends upon the Testimony of others so framed and circumstantiated, that it is altogether, at least morally impossible to deceive, or be deceived; as that *Cæsar* and *Alexander* formerly existed, as *Rome* and *Constantinople* do now; whereas Arguments drawn from Antiquity, Amplitude, Sanctity, &c. are of another kind, as being wholly artificial, and consequently most different from those which beget this Moral Certainty. Besides, there is none of these Notes, wherein the *Greek* Church may not equally glory with the *Latin*. Sanctity, Amplitude, Antiquity, and constancy of Martyrs none can deny to her. As for Miracles, the *Greeks* by the confession of the *Latins* have somewhat admirable, which is not to be found in the *Roman* Church. For *Lupus* [9] relates out of *Chr. Angelus* and *Leo Allatius*, that it is at this day most frequent among the *Greeks*, that the dead Bodies of Excommunicate Persons immediately after death, grow black, swell, and become very hard, nor can be dissolved before the Bishop gives them Absolution, which being once pronounced, they are reduced into Dust: *The Divine Goodness*, saith *Lupus*, *by these* [10] *Miracles comforting and confirming in the Faith, the poor Christians oppressed with the* Turkish *Tyranny*. In this Miracle four things may be observed. 1. That it is not only boasted by the *Greeks*, but also acknowledged by the *Latins*. 2. That it is an ordinary, and almost daily Miracle. 3. That it is annexed to the Episcopal Dignity, so as their Excommunication and Absolution hath a sensible and supernatural effect. 4. That it serveth not only to favour the Christian Religion professed by the *Greeks*, but also their private error. For as *Lupus* observeth, They imagine the Absolution given after death to be valid, and to deliver from the Torments of Hell it self; which seemeth to be confirmed by the sensible effect

[9] In Concil. tom. 5. p. 543.

[10] *Captivos sub Turcicâ tyrannide Christianos divina bonitas consolatur per talia miracula & in Evangelicâ fide confirmat.*

effect that immediately follows the Absolution. What have the *Latins* like to this? Their pretended Miracles are not acknowledged by their Adversaries, but rather convinced of falsity by them, and even by many of their own Communion; they are rare, not ordinary, nor annexed to any Ecclesiastical Dignity; and such as, if they were true, serve to confirm only the Christian Religion in general, not their own particular Tenets.

It is manifest therefore, That those Arguments are not certain, which are deduced from the Notes of the Church; since, if they were so, they would demonstrate, what our Adversaries think to be false, That the *Greek* is the True and Infallible Church. This might be evidently evinced, if we considered each Note singly. But besides that it is already accurately performed by our Reverend B. *Morton*. *Jo. Gerardus* and others, it seems not very necessary in this place. Here therefore I finish, and in one word conclude, That the Papists, who boast of having so many immovable Foundations of their Faith, have not so much as one which is solid; and that what they believe, they do it pertinaciously indeed, but neither certainly nor firmly.

FINIS.

Dr. *Cave*'s Lives of the Primitive Fathers, in 2 Vol. *Folio.*
Dr. *Cary*'s Chronological Account of Ancient Time. *fol.*
Hooker's, Eccleſiaſtical Policy. *fol.*
Sir *John Burlace*'s Hiſtory of the Iriſh Rebellion. *fol.*
The Laws of this Realm concerning Jeſuits, Seminary Prieſts, Recuſants, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, explained by divers Judgments and Reſolutions of the *Judges*; with other Obſervations thereupon. By *William Cawley* Eſq; *fol.*
Dr. *Tamerſon*'s Explication on the *Creed*, the *Commandments*, and *Lord*'s *Prayer*, in 3 Vol. *fol.*
Biſhop *Nicholſon* on the *Church-Catechiſm.* 4o.
Mr. *John Cave*'s ſeven occaſional Sermons. 4o.
Biſhop *Wilkin*'s Natural Religion. 8o.
——— His Fifteen Sermons. 8o.
Mr. *Tanner*'s *Primordia*: Or, the Riſe and Growth of the *Firſt Church* of God deſcribed. 8o.
Spaniard's Conſpiracy againſt the State of *Venice.* 8o.
Dr. *Cave*'s Primitive Chriſtianity, in three parts. 8o.
Certain genuine Remains of the Lord *Bacon*, in Arguments *Civil*, *Moral*, *Natural*, &c. with a large account of all his Works. By Dr. *Tho. Tenijon.* 8o.
Dr. *Henry Bagſham*'s Diſcourſes on ſelect Texts. 8o.
Mr. *Seller*'s State of the *Church* in the three firſt *Centuries.*
Dr. *Burnet*'s Account of the Life and Death of the Earl of *Rochester.* 8o.
———Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England.* 8o.
———Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes in the Diſpoſing of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Church-lands. 8o.
———Relation of the preſent ſtate of the difference between the *French* King and the Court of *Rome*; to which is added, the Pope's Brief to the Aſſembly of the Clergy, and their Proteſtation, publiſhed by Dr. *Burnet.* 8o.
Dr. *Cumber*'s Companion to the Altar. 8o.
Dr. *Sherlock*'s Practical Diſcourſe of Religious Aſſemblies. 8o.
———Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Unreaſonableneſs of Separation. 8o.
———A Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in anſwer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob* about *Catholick Communion.* 8o.
Sir *Rob. Filmer*'s *Patriarcha*, or natural Power of Kings. 8o.
Biſhop *Werrenhall*'s Method and Order for private Devotion. 12o.
Valentine's Private Devotions. 4o.
Dr. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus. fol.*
Dr. *John Lightfoot*'s Works in *Engliſh*, in 2 Vol. *fol.*
Sir *Tho. Brown*'s Vulgar Errors, with all the reſt of his Works. *fol.*
Patris Simonii Diſquiſitionis Criticæ de Variis per diverſa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Caſtigat. Opuſc. If. Voſſii de Sibyllinis Oraculis. 4o.
The Caſe of *Lay-Communion* with the Church of *England* conſidered. 4o.
Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith*, and Dr. *Hen. Hammond*, about Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell. 8o.
Dean *Stratford*'s Diſſwaſive from Revenge. 8o.

Dr.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

Dr. *Hez. Burton*'s firſt Volume of Diſcourſes; of Purity and Charity; of Repentance, and of ſeeking the Kingdom of God. Publiſhed by Dean *Tillotſon*. 8o.

——His ſecond Volume of Diſcourſes on ſeveral Practical Subjects. *Octavo.*

Sir *Thomas More*'s *Utopia*, newly made Engliſh by Dr. *Burnet*. 8o.

Mr. *Seller*'s Devout Communicant; aſſiſted with Rules, Meditations, Prayers and Anthems. 12*s.*

Dr. *Towerſon* of the Sacraments in General.

——Of the Sacrament of Baptiſm in particular. 8o.

The Hiſtory of the *COUNCIL of TRENT*: in which, beſides the Ordinary Acts of the Council, are declared many notable Occurrences which happned in Chriſtendom for 40 Years, and particularly the Practices of the *COURT* of *ROME* to hinder the *Reformation of Their Errors*, and to maintain *Their Greatneſs*. Written by *Father Paul* of the *SERVI*. To which is added, the *Life* of the *Author*, and the *Hiſtory* of the *Inquiſition*.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

Dr. *Burnets* Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Church of *England*, in 2 Vol. *Fol.*

A Collection of Sixteen ſeveral Tracts, and Diſcourſes. Written in the Years, from 1678, to 1685. inclusive, by *Gilbert Burnet*, D. D. To which are added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pool*'s Secret Powers. The Hiſtory of the *Powder-Treaſon*, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits dying Speeches, who were Executed for the Popiſh Plot, 1679. 4o.

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeant*'s [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*: Made Engliſh by a Perſon of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the ſaid Biſhop: Collected and written by the ſame Hand. *Octavo.*

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddeſworth* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Sevil*) in Matters of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*, *Octavo.*

The Decree made at *ROME* the ſecond of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *Caſuiſts*. *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.* Firſt and Second Parts.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented.] *Quarto.*

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the ſeveral Articles propoſed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church.*] *Quarto.*

A Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; againſt the Exceptions of Monſieur de *Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 4o.

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. 8o.

A Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented: being an Anſwer to the Firſt, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented;] and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Chriſtian's* Obligation to read the *Holy Scriptures*. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man's Reply* to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. 24o.

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the *Authority* of the *Catholick Church* in matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* concerning the *Unity* and *Authority* of the *Catholick Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book, called [*The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation*] made more generally uſeful by omitting *Perſonal Conteſts*, but inſerting whatſoever concerns the common Cauſe of *Proteſtants*, or defends the *Church of England*, with an exact Table of Contents; and an Addition of ſome genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's* never before Printed, *viz.* againſt the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Tradition*, &c. And an account of what moved the Author to turn Papiſt, wth his *Confutation* of the ſaid Motives.

An Hiſtorical Treatiſe written by an *AUTHOR* of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, touching *TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. Wherein is made appear, That according to the Principles of *THAT CHURCH*, This Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. 4o.

The Proteſtant's Companion: Or an Impartial Survey, and Compariſon of the *Proteſtant Religion* as by Law eſtabliſhed, with the main *Doctrines of Popery*. Wherein is ſhewed, that Popery is contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers and Councils; and that proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the *Ancient Fathers* for ſeveral hundred Years, and the Confeſſion of the moſt Learned Papiſts themſelves. 4o.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatiſe ſhewing that the *Roman Church* falſly claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth* mentioned by S. *Paul* in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *Chap.* 3. *Verſ.* 15. 4o.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scripture Aſſerted. 4o.

A Short Summary of the principal Controverſies between the *Church* of *England* and the *Church* of *Rome*; being a Vindication of ſeveral Proteſtant Doctrines, in Anſwer to a late Pamphlet intituled, [*Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture Proofs*]. 4o.

An Anſwer to a late Pamphlet, intituled, [The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the *Church* of *England* concerning one Special Branch of the King's Prerogative, *viz. In diſpenſing with the Penal Laws.* 4o.

A

A Discourse of the [illegible]
the Adoration [illegible]
first on this [illegible]
to the [illegible]
Two Di[illegible]

The [illegible] Church, as it is now [illegible] by Cardinal Bellarmine, Translated and compared [illegible] with a Table of the Contents.

[illegible] Letters sent to a young Gentlewoman in France, in a dangerous Consumption of which she died. By W. W. 12o.

The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late Book, intituled, The Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome.

A PRIVATE PRAYER to be used by Distressed Times.

A true account of a Conference held about [illegible] between A. Pulton, Jesuite, and Tho. Bridges, [illegible] and followed after it. 4o.

The Vindication of [illegible], or Schoolmaster to Long [illegible] A. Pulton, Jesuite, Schoolmaster to the Savoy; together with [illegible] Discourse with Mr. Stevens &c.

A Discourse shewing that Protestants are on the safer side, [illegible] the erection of the Judgment of their Adversaries; and that Their Religion is the Way to Heaven. 4o.

Six Consequences concerning the Eucharist, wherein is shewed, That the Doctrine of Transubstantiation overthrows the Proofs of Christian Religion.

A Discourse concerning the pretended Sacrament of Extreme Unction; with an account of the corruptions and beginnings of it in the Western Church in Three Parts. With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of Condom.

The Papists [illegible] Heretical Schismatical Church, or no Church of Christ, Glass, [illegible] the Public Reformation and Queen Elizabeth, [illegible] of Protestants, and Papists answered; the First, to the Reflections of [illegible] Second, to the Book sent against the Six Conferences.

A Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the new Exposition of Monsieur de Meaux, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART, In which the Exposition there has been given of the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition is fully vindicated; the Definition of Old and New Popery [illegible] cleared; and the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in Point of Image-worship more particularly considered. 4o.

The Incurable Corruption of the Church of Rome. By the Author of the late Conference concerning the Eucharist. 4o.

Mr. Pulton Considered in his Sincerity, Boldness, Authorities, &c. In a Just Answer to what he hath hitherto published in his True Account, his True and Full Account of a Conference, &c. His Remarks, and in these his pretended Confutation of what he calls Dr. T's Rule of Faith. By Tho. [illegible] D.D. 4o.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of [illegible] wholly different from those of the [illegible] Church; [illegible] with the belief of Transubstantiation. Being a Collection [illegible] SENTENTIÆ PATRUM, NUBES TESTIUM, and other Late Collections of the Fathers pretending to the contrary. 4o.